

The

# American Historical Review

## BYZANTINE IMPERIALISM IN EGYPT<sup>1</sup>

In this paper, which attempts rather ambitiously a survey of the period from Diocletian to the capture of Alexandria by the Arabs in 641 A.D.,<sup>2</sup> I have not sought to make any contribution to the historical material available, but merely to set forth my own impression of the various forces which were at work, their interrelation, and their results. My hope is that the interpretation thus given will serve as a basis for discussion and suggestion, and if I seem at times to speak dogmatically, I trust that this will be attributed to the character of the paper and not to any conviction as to my right to speak *ex cathedra*.

While it is now generally recognized that the history of the Byzantine Empire as a whole is by no means a record of continuous decay, but one of alternating periods of revival and decline, it must be admitted that the story of Byzantine imperialism in Egypt is a story of progressive disintegration. Nevertheless this episode in the

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Ancient History section at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, Washington, D. C., Dec. 27, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> The following works are of especial use in the study of this subject: N. H. Baynes, "Alexandria and Constantinople: a Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy", in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XII. 145-156; *id.*, *Byzantine Empire* (1926); H. I. Bell, "Byzantine Servile State in Egypt", *id.*, "Hellenic Culture in Egypt", *id.*, "Decay of a Civilization", in *Jour. of Egypt. Arch.*, IV. 86-106, VIII. 139-155, X. 201-216; Ch. Diehl, "Une Crise Monétaire au VI<sup>e</sup> Siècle", in *Revue des Etudes Grecques*, XXXII. 157-166; H. Gelzer, *Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte* (1909); Matthias Gelzer, *Studien zur Byzantinischen Verwaltung Aegyptens* (1909); V. Martin, *La Fiscalité Romaine en Égypte aux Trois Premiers Siècles* (1925); J. Maspero, "Horapollon et la Fin du Paganisme Égyptien", in *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, XI. (1913) 163-195; *id.*, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie*, 518-616 (1923); *id.*, *L'Organisation Militaire de l'Égypte Byzantine* (1912); J. G. Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (third ed., 1924); Germaine Rouillard, *L'Administration Civile de l'Égypte Byzantine* (1925); W. Shubart, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (1918); *id.*, *Aegypten von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf Mohammed* (1922); *id.*, *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil* (sec. ed., 1923); Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, vol. I., pt. I. (1912); F. L. Woodward, *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire* (1916).

history of Egypt may well claim our attention as involving the still perplexing problem of the government of a so-called "inferior" race. It is also interesting from the complexity of the political, social, and economic forces at work, which led at one and the same time to the decay of a civilization and to the rise of a nationality.

To understand the problems which faced the imperial government in the administration of Egypt one must begin with a brief survey of conditions as they existed there in the early fourth century of our era. At this time the population of Egypt comprised the following elements: Roman, Greek, Greco-Egyptian, and Egyptian. In spite of the extension of Roman citizenship by Caracalla's edict and of Diocletian's attempts at Romanization, the true Roman element in Egypt remained a negligible quantity. Likewise the real Greeks were few in number and restricted almost entirely to Ptolemais and Naukratis. Much more numerous and important were the Greco-Egyptians, the product, as their name implies, of six centuries of fusion of the two peoples, who formed the bulk of the population of Alexandria and the *metropoleis* or administrative capitals of the nomes. Culturally, this element represented the main force of Hellenism in Egypt, economically it comprised the middle-class landholders. But by far the largest group was formed by the native Egyptians, who were the agricultural laborers and tenant farmers as well as the poorer elements of the town population. These "hewers of wood and drawers of water", the predecessors of the modern *fellahin*, were distinguished by their latent hostility to foreign rule in general and to Hellenism in particular, as represented by their social and political superiors. Thus in the very character of the population of Egypt we see the possibilities of serious administrative difficulties.

But the question of governing a subject people whom the Ptolemies and the Caesars had shut out deliberately from absorption into the body of the ruling class was complicated by a pressing economic problem, which had its roots in the period of the Principate. The policy of the Roman government had been to collect the greatest possible revenue from Egypt. At best, the Egyptian was but a sheep to be shorn. The application of this principle had resulted in crushing the peasantry under a load of taxation and enforced corvées, while at the same time it had gone far towards ruining the middle class of landholders by burdening them with liturgical services in connection with raising the revenue, by making them responsible for the tax quota of their districts, and by forcing them to cultivate, or at least pay the rental for, the vacant state lands. Impoverishment, flight, and the abandonment of farms and villages were most eloquent testimonials of the results of a misguided fiscal policy. This de-

plorable economic condition was rendered worse by the anarchy which prevailed in the latter part of the third century. In spite of the restoration of order and the revival of irrigation, the proprietors and the peasants alike remained in a precarious condition, and many towns and villages were never reoccupied. We thus find the government face to face with a second serious problem; that of combating an economic decline.

The general situation was still further complicated by the spread of Christianity. Up to the time of Diocletian the new religion seems to have had its main strength among the Greeks of Alexandria and the country towns, but the last great persecutions which began in 302 scattered its adherents throughout the country and brought them into contact with the rural population. In the course of the fourth century the new faith became the dominant religion throughout the land. It is important to note that, although Christianity came to the Egyptians through the Greeks, it did nothing to heal the breach between the peasantry and those whom they looked upon as their oppressors. On the contrary, leading as it did to the revival of the native tongue (Coptic), it soon became a means of expressing the latent national feelings of the subject people. Nor was Egyptian paganism any more friendly towards the imperial government, which from the time of Constantine I. was identified with Christianity.

In tracing the course of Byzantine imperialism in Egypt it will be convenient to distinguish two periods: the first running up to the year 538 A.D., the second from 538 to 641 A.D.

The first period opened with the establishment of the new administrative system of Diocletian and Constantine I., one effect of which was to put an end to the unique position of Egypt within the Roman Empire. In so far as this involved the establishment of an out and out autocratic régime, Egypt was unaffected, for it had always known autocracy; and the introduction there of the new bureaucracy resulted more in a change of titles than a change of system. However, more striking innovations were the subdivision of Egypt into several provinces and the separation of civil and military authority, in conformity with principles applied throughout the empire in the vain hope of promoting honest, efficient, and stable government. Another change was the conversion of the nomes into municipal territoria of the erstwhile *metropoleis*. The new tax system, based on the units of *caput* and *jugum*, came into force, but can not have been a great novelty in a country used to the land and capitation taxes of the previous period.

But these were outward changes. The Egyptian policy of Constantinople was inherited, together with the aforesaid problems, from

the preceding epoch. The main feature of that policy was the fiscal exploitation of the land of Egypt and its population, largely in the interest of provisioning Constantinople (after 330) and Alexandria. In raising the revenue the government still adhered to the use of liturgical officials for whom the municipal senates had to assume collective responsibility. It was inevitable that these should seek to save their properties at the expense of the poorer agricultural elements and try to shift upon them the deficiencies of the local tax quota. The policy of making the landholders responsible for the taxes or rentals upon unleased state lands remained also in force, and seems to have developed into a systematic attempt to place all state land in the possession of private persons, either by attribution (*epibole*) or compulsory hereditary lease. As a result both public land and public tenants disappear from Egyptian records after the fourth century. With no relief in prospect, proprietors and tenants alike turned to the time-honored path of escape by flight. To prevent this the government stepped in and fixed both classes to the soil, as well as to their inherited status.

The converse of the decay of the class of small proprietors was the rise of the great estates. This movement had its origin in the ambitions of the upper official class and in the desire of the peasants to escape from their crushing burdens. As the former powerful personages were able to defy successfully the municipal tax collectors and the imperial police, the small landholders and peasantry sought refuge under their patronage in the hope, largely futile it must be admitted, of escaping from their obligations. The formation of these great estates threatened the sum of the revenues and the imperial government fulminated vigorously against them in its constitutions after the middle of the fourth century. But in vain. Here as elsewhere the bureaucracy had got out of hand, and in 415 the government capitulated, recognized the institution of patronage, bound the clients to the lands of their patrons as coloni, and gave the patrons the right of collecting taxes from their clients and paying them to the state without interference from local tax officers (*auto-pragia*). In the fourth century the land system in Egypt is characterized by the prevalence of small holdings, in the sixth it is characterized by the great estates, whose owners in their official capacity as governors, pagarchs, and autocratic landlords control the administration.

The fiscal policy of the empire which had resulted in creating an aristocracy able and ready to defy the central authority had also ruined the very class upon which the government might have depended for loyal support—the municipal senatorial order. This was

all the more tragic since it was the chief cause of the decline of Greek cultural influences and the non-appearance of an important Greek Christian element, which might have been a powerful obstacle in the path of the rising nationalistic tendencies of the Egyptians.

It is high time to turn to the religious developments and to trace the growth of a breach between the Egyptians and the empire from this side also. Here two factors must be borne clearly in mind: (1) the ecclesiastical relations of Alexandria and the other bishoprics of the empire, in particular Constantinople, and (2) the relations of the patriarchs of Alexandria to the people of Egypt. The root of the matter was the determination of a number of able patriarchs of Alexandria to assert their independence of the see of Constantinople, and for that matter of Rome also. In the East it was a well-recognized principle that the position of a city in the sphere of the political administration should determine its position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But, when the patriarchs of Constantinople tried to assert their primacy among the Eastern bishops, they were opposed by the older patriarchs, and among their opponents Alexandria took the lead. The recognition of the primacy of Constantinople by the second ecumenical council in 381 A.D. by no means settled the question. Although Constantine I. and Theodosius I. had been able to repress by force Alexandrine opposition to the decisions of ecumenical councils, under Theodosius II. Constantinople was humbled successively by Theophilus and his successor Cyril. Dioscuros continued the Alexandrine tradition of ecclesiastical diplomacy by refusing to submit to Emperor Marcian and the council of Chalcedon (451) which condemned the Monophysite doctrine. But Marcian was strong enough to banish Dioscuros and the power of the Alexandrine see outside of Egypt was at an end. Constantinople had triumphed over Alexandria, but at the cost of creating the Egyptian Monophysite Church which was to remain a bitter foe of imperial orthodoxy. For the patriarch of Alexandria had no rival in his control over the Egyptian churches, and he enjoyed the support and confidence of all but a small party of the church in Alexandria. Not only was the patriarch the spiritual head of the Egyptians, but he became the incarnation of Egyptian nationalistic tendencies. As a recent writer has ably expressed it: "Egypt was still a nation, and the old kingship was but transformed: the Patriarch, as a spiritual Pharaoh, was enthroned in the capital; he was the representative of a people and for them his word was law; from the desert, populous with anchorites, he could call forth his armies, and the monkish hosts, wielding their clubs, were ever ready to obey his

summons."<sup>2</sup> Egyptian national feeling rallied to the support of the memory of the great patriarchs and readily seized upon this method of expressing its animosity to Constantinople. The term Melchites, or Kingsmen, applied to the orthodox from the middle of the fifth century, shows how closely religious and political opposition were combined. It was Alexandrian opposition to New Rome which produced the Monophysite heresy, not the heresy which produced the schism.

Another form in which Egyptian nationalism revealed itself was in the revival of racial pride shown both in pagan and Christian literature. The Copts (to use their later name) regarded themselves as the heirs of the Ancient Egyptians, who, in their opinion, were the source of all civilization. Everything worth while was said to have an Egyptian origin. Legends grew up which claimed that Egypt was the birthplace not merely of great political figures like Diocletian but even of Christ himself. This vanity was piqued by the contempt which Byzantine writers expressed towards Egypt's inhabitants, its monuments, and its traditions.

By the early sixth century, then, we may picture conditions in Egypt somewhat as follows. Overtaxation, the burden of personal services and liturgies, and a corrupt administration had rendered the peasantry and the remnants of the class of small proprietors hostile to the imperial government and its representatives. This hostility was fanned into a flame of hatred by the religious conflict between Alexandria and Constantinople. The conflict thus awakened assumed the character of a national movement, which expressed itself in a revival of national cultural traditions and in open acts of rebellion against the government. A wide gulf separated the interests of the poor cultivators from those of the great landlords, but even these were only loyal to the empire in so far as it did not interfere with their privileged position. The slender props of government were the senatorial class of Alexandria, the imperial officials, and the soldiery.

From this we see that when Justinian came to the throne he had to face essentially the same problems as Diocletian, only in an aggravated form. Devoted as he was to the ideal of "one state, one law, one church", he was bound to intervene actively to readjust conditions in the Egyptian diocese. After an initial period of toleration he attacked the religious problem and tried to force upon the Monophysites a formula under which they could be united to the Orthodox Church. This attempt was a failure: the Monophysites remained unreconciled and irreconcilable. Justinian's administrative

<sup>2</sup> N. H. Baynes, *Byzantine Empire*, p. 78.

reforms were promulgated in his famous Edict XIII. (538/539 A.D.). His prefatory statement, that there was so much confusion in Egypt that the government at Constantinople did not know what was going on there, should perhaps be taken as referring to fiscal conditions only, but at any rate it shows that the emperor was alive to the disorders that prevailed. Still the reforms themselves fail to reveal any attempt to grapple with the fundamental causes of the situation. Fiscal interests predominated, and such changes as were made in the civil and military organization were introduced to secure greater efficiency in collecting the grain for Constantinople and Alexandria and in raising the other taxes.

The outstanding feature of the new order was the abandonment of Diocletian's principle of the separation of civil and military authority and the concentration of both in the hands of the provincial governors; a reform which had already been carried out elsewhere and had been partially introduced even in Egypt itself. From now on Egypt was divided into five separate provinces, each under a governor clothed with civil and military power and directly subordinate to the Pretorian Prefect of the Orient. The future was to show that this administrative tinkering was as unavailing to put an end to graft and inefficiency as were his later attempts (Edict XI., 559 A.D.) to deal with the problem of debased coinage.

After Justinian, religious differences continued to complicate the situation. Following a brief respite under Tiberius, Phokas resumed the persecution of the Monophysites, and Heraclius, subsequent to his victory over Persia, insisted upon a reconciliation of the heretics and the state church. The refusal of the Copts to accept the Ekthesis of 638 resulted in a great persecution which continued until the very end of the Arab conquest and deeply embittered the Egyptians against the Byzantines.

The papyrus documents of the late sixth and early seventh century indicate that conditions were just as bad if not worse than before Justinian's reforms. The great proprietors, combining local and official provincial posts, appear as a class of hereditary office holders, maintaining their own troops, ships, messenger service, and even petty courts. Imperial officers and troops are openly defied, the rights of the taxpayers are violated, and the government provides no redress. Corruption is rife, and, as Justinian himself had been forced to admit, officials on the ground could spurn imperial edicts. The support given by Egypt as a whole to the revolt of Heraclius shows the attitude of disloyalty which pervaded all classes of the population.

The fruits of Byzantine imperialism then were in the first place

the economic and cultural decadence of Egypt, in the second the development of an hostile Egyptian nation. The general weaknesses of the imperial policy were adherence to the old Roman idea of the fiscal exploitation of the Egyptians as subjects, the overdevelopment of bureaucracy, and the preoccupation of the government with the problems of maintaining religious unity and upholding the political prestige of the empire. The ruin of the middle classes, the growth of the great landed proprietors, and the bureaucratic maladministration were ills which Egypt shared with the empire as a whole. What was more peculiar to Egypt was the revival of an Egyptian nationality which expressed itself in a conscious linguistic, cultural, religious, and political hostility to its rulers. Under these conditions Egypt was governed and held only by military force, and could not be expected to protect itself for the empire from outside attack. Accordingly, the continuation of Byzantine rule was dependent upon the presence of an adequate garrison, and this Constantinople failed to provide.

Whether because of inadequate resources, or a mistaken sense of security, or fear of rebellion, the Byzantine army of occupation was organized primarily as a police force to support the civil authorities in the maintenance of order and, above all, the collection of revenue. It consisted, in the sixth and seventh centuries, of some twenty-five thousand men, split up into between seventy and eighty units of some three hundred each. These were distributed among the chief towns, with smaller detachments in subsidiary guard stations. They did not form part of the field army of the empire, and each of the five provincial governors had independent command over the troops in his district, subject to the general oversight of the *magister militum per Orientem*. Such was the force which, even when aided by its fortifications, apparently gave no serious opposition to the Persians in 617, and was later defeated by the Arab invaders, whose total strength reached some sixteen thousand men. Its defeat was due to the lack of military experience, the divided command and failure of the governors to coöperate, the jealousy of the commanders, and, to some degree, the disaffection of the Copts. However, the latter did not rise *en masse* to aid the invaders, but for the most part remained passive spectators of the struggle, hostile to both Byzantines and Arabs.

A. E. R. BOAK.

## THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND NEUTRAL RIGHTS, 1861-1865

DURING the American Civil War the governments of Great Britain and the United States found their traditional rôles reversed. The world's greatest naval power played the part of a neutral, learning with some difficulty its unfamiliar lines. The United States, long the foremost champion of neutral rights, donned, in its grim struggle for national unity, the garments of a dominant sea power. In their new positions, however, neither government forgot its previous professions or the dictates of its future interests. Both realized that the precedents which they were making would prove of capital importance in a future war, when British prize courts would invoke the new American decisions in order to justify further extensions of belligerent rights against American neutral shippers.

No mere love of consistency, or momentary interest in diminishing friction with neutrals, led Seward to oppose the adoption by the United States of extreme belligerent pretensions. In his notable controversy with Secretary Welles concerning the treatment of mails on a neutral prize, the arguments by which he convinced President Lincoln and laid the basis of the present American position on the subject looked to the future as well as to the past and present. In most European wars the United States would seek the advantages of neutrality. It was obvious, Seward argued, that "any belligerent claim which we make during the existing war, will be urged against us as an unanswerable precedent when [we] may ourselves be at peace".<sup>1</sup>

In similar fashion the British government, while defending the rights of British merchants and shipowners, kept one eye on the precedents and the other on the future interests of the mistress of the seas. For an understanding of the development of British policy as to neutral rights in this period the correspondence exchanged between the Admiralty and the Foreign Office, and between the Admiralty and the British commander-in-chief in American waters, is indispensable. The recent opening of the Admiralty Papers in the Public Record Office to the year 1878 makes available much new material throwing light on the diplomatic history of the American

<sup>1</sup> Department of State, Report Book no. 8, Seward to Lincoln, Apr. 24, 1863. A longer extract is printed in the document section of this number. See, also, J. B. Moore, *Digest*, VII, 479-484; Gideon Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, pp. 85-122.

Civil War. The opinions of the law officers of the crown, hitherto confidential, reveal British official views of international law in one of its most interesting periods of development. In the present article only certain phases of this new material will be treated. Some of the more important orders and reports appear in the document section of this issue of the *Review*.

While British and American naval officers were familiarizing themselves with their new rôles the risk of a serious clash in American waters was great. On the shoulders of the British commander-in-chief of the North America and West Indies station rested a diplomatic responsibility of the first order, borne in a manner beyond praise. Few statesmen did as much to keep the peace between Great Britain and the United States in that stormy period as did Admiral Sir Alexander Milne. From his first service afloat as a boy of thirteen in the *Leander*, the flagship of his father, Sir David Milne, on the North America station, he had spent many years in American waters. Twelve years' duty as junior lord of the Admiralty from 1847 to 1859 gave him administrative experience and grasp of British foreign policy. When he took command of the North America and West Indies station in 1860 he had already shown the high qualities of tact, sound judgment, and administrative skill which were to carry him to the highest rank in the Royal Navy.<sup>2</sup>

As early as December 22, 1860, the Admiralty, at the request of the Foreign Office, had instructed Milne to abstain "from any measure or demonstration likely to give umbrage to any party in the United States, or to bear the appearance of partizanship on either side; if the internal dissensions in those States should be carried to the extent of separation".<sup>3</sup> In accordance with these instructions, and with the long-standing practice of the Royal Navy to avoid the ports of the United States for fear of desertions, Milne refrained from sending any ships to the coast of the United States until the end of May, when he despatched cruisers to protect British commerce in the Gulf of Florida and on the coast of the Southern States.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See "Sir Alexander Milne" by Sir John Laughton in *Dictionary of National Biography, Supplement*. Although a few of his letters were published in the *Parliamentary Papers* during the American Civil War and in the *Appendix to the Case for the Geneva Arbitration on the Part of Her Britannic Majesty* (1872), the bulk of his voluminous correspondence remains unpublished.

<sup>3</sup> Adm. 13/7, no. 466 M. The writer owes to the kind help of Mrs. V. Heddon of the Admiralty Library the finding of this and several other despatches, and the transcription of most of the material cited in this article and that printed in the document section of this number.

<sup>4</sup> Adm. 1/5759, Milne to Secretary to the Admiralty, *Nile* at Bermuda, May 3, 1861. Milne had decided on May 1 to send a vessel to Havana to protect British vessels "from the lawless and reckless consequences" which privateering might

Their commanders were instructed, "unless protection to British Life should absolutely demand it, . . . to avoid entering into any Ports in the occupation of Confederate Authorities or Troops, as the visit of any of H.M.'s Ships might probably be interpreted into a disposition on the part of H.M.'s Government to give countenance and support to the secession movement . . .".<sup>5</sup>

Alarmed at the menace to British neutral commerce from Confederate privateers and Northern blockaders, the British government had already ordered the reinforcement of Milne's squadron on May 1, and had issued the Neutrality Proclamation of May 13.<sup>6</sup> On May 30 Milne issued confidential instructions to his cruisers engaged in protecting commerce, which, with supplements issued on June 30 and November 12, 1861, remained the guide for the conduct of British commanders throughout the war. These instructions, and the correspondence concerning them of the Admiralty, the Foreign Office, and the law officers, indicate a scrupulous determination to maintain the strictest neutrality between North and South, and to refrain, in the protection of British commerce, from establishing precedents which might hamper British sea power in a future war.<sup>7</sup>

The British orders of June 1, 1861, forbidding the entry of prizes into the ports or territorial waters of the United Kingdom or of British colonies or possessions abroad proved a great advantage to the North, which had a large commerce exposed to Confederate commerce-destroyers and slight need of sending its own prizes to neutral ports.<sup>8</sup> Against the practical operation of this rule the Confederate government promptly protested.<sup>9</sup> The cup of Southern

engender (*ibid.*, May 1). Adm. 1/5767, Lyons to Milne, May 25, 1861; Adm. 1/5871, P. 182, Milne's memoranda for Sir James Hope, Mar. 15, 1864. The capital "P" in this and other citations stands for the words "North America and West Indies Station" in the Admiralty key.

<sup>5</sup> Adm. 1/5759, P. 237, May 30, 1861, article 5. See document section.

<sup>6</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII, "North America, no. 1", pp. 20-21, 27-30.

<sup>7</sup> These three sets of instructions are in the document section, annotated with extracts from the Admiralty and Foreign Office correspondence.

<sup>8</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII, "North America, no. 1", p. 38.  
"The restrictions imposed upon the use of British waters by the Belligerents in the present war, are, although of necessity enforced equally against both Belligerents, in effect so small an inconvenience to the U. S. and so great a disadvantage to their antagonists that I had hoped that the adoption of them by HM's Govt. would have been regarded by the Federal Authorities as an act of friendship rather than of courtesy. I was not surprised to see the regulations denounced by Mr. Davis in his message to the Congress at Richmond, but I am, I confess, both pained and disappointed at seeing them made a subject of complaint by the authorities of the U. S." Adm. 1/5850, Lyons to Russell, Jan. 30, 1863, no. 82.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies*, sec. ser., III, 231, 241, hereafter cited as *O.R.N.*. Cf. *Messages and Papers of the Confederacy*, ed. J. D. Richardson, I, 281, 349.

bitterness was filled, however, by the acquiescence of the British government in the Federal blockade.

After their abortive attempt to avert the institution of a blockade,<sup>10</sup> the British authorities showed such forbearance concerning the enforcement of Lincoln's proclamations of April 19 and 27 that it roused the ire of the Confederate authorities. In accordance with Milne's instructions of May 30, British commanders cruised along the Southern coast, compiling reports on the state of the blockade which, with others from British consuls, were laid before Parliament in the following February.<sup>11</sup> The commanders were first instructed, if they deemed the Federal force insufficient to render the blockade effective, to represent their "views to the Commander of the Blockading Squadron in courteous but precise terms and with full particulars in writing". These communications to the Northern blockaders, however, were discontinued in November after Earl Russell had informed the Admiralty that they were unnecessary, and might "possibly be attended with evil effects".<sup>12</sup> Russell's celebrated letter of February 15, 1862, to Lord Lyons, defining an effective blockade, opened wide the flood-gates of Confederate protests. Summarizing the reports from the British commanders, he declared:

assuming that the blockade is duly notified, and also that a number of ships is stationed and remains at the entrance of a port, sufficient really to prevent access to it or to create an evident danger of entering or leaving it, and that these ships do not voluntarily permit ingress or egress, the fact that various ships may have successfully escaped through it (as in the particular instances here referred to) will not of itself prevent the blockade from being an effective one by international law. . . .<sup>13</sup>

That this definition was dictated by British interests as well as British precedents was obvious. Five days earlier the *London Times* had pointed out that: "a blockade is by far the most formidable weapon of offence we possess. Surely we ought not to be over-ready to blunt its edge or injure its temper?" Its leader of March 1, praising Russell's definition, declared that: "England is too great to be often neutral, and should not forget that the arguments she might now employ against her neighbour might, we know not how soon, be retorted against herself with all the force of admissions.

<sup>10</sup> Mass. Hist. Soc., *Proceedings*, XLVIII, 204-205, 217-234.

<sup>11</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 8". Although not all the reports of the commanders were here printed, there seems to have been no *parti pris* in the selection.

<sup>12</sup> See article 3 of Milne's instructions of May 30, 1861, and the appended note in the document section.

<sup>13</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 8", pp. 119-120. For Southern protests, see *O.R.N.*, sec. ser., III. 357, 380-382, 495-498, 585-588, 643-645, 688, 695-697, 703-704.

. . ." The Solicitor General, Sir Roundell Palmer, based his defense of the government's policy as to the blockade, in the House of Commons, March 7, on the argument that: "England has as strong an interest as any Power in the world in understanding well what she is about, when she is invited to take a step that may hereafter be quoted against herself, and may make it impossible for her, with honour or consistency, to avail herself of her superiority at sea."<sup>14</sup>

Admiral Milne, too, in his comments on the blockade, looked to the future interests of British sea power. On July 8, 1861, he called the attention of the Admiralty to the case of the schooner *Tartar*, of Halifax, whose registry had been endorsed by a boarding officer from U.S.S. *Union* in a manner contrary to the established rule that notice of a blockade must not be more extensive than the blockade itself. "I conceive", Milne dryly added, that "a record of the manner in which the United States Cruisers are exercising their belligerent right of visit and search may be useful for reference at some future day."<sup>15</sup> Although the United States government, at the outset of the war, admitted the right of neutral armed vessels to enter even blockaded ports, Milne took the view that:

the Blockading Power must, and ought to have the right (whether exercised or not) to debar all access to, or egress from a Blockaded Port, as it is very easy to conceive that in the case of the Ships of War of a doubtful neutral power much prejudice might result to the Blockading Forces from free and unrestrained intercourse with the blockaded port when preparations were being made for an attack, and as a general rule all attempts to distinguish between a Military and a Commercial Blockade must necessarily be fallacious. . . .<sup>16</sup>

Despite their interest in keeping open a line of mail communication with the Confederacy—for the transmission of official despatches by a blockade runner was deemed improper—both the Admiralty and Earl Russell concurred in Milne's view. The latter observed: "that with a view to British interests, it is not desirable to establish any positive and unconditional right of entering a blockaded Port by the Ship of War of a neutral power."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, third ser., CLXV, 1212. Lyons had written to Russell, July 11, 1859, that the Americans "are very anxious to obtain our co-operation, and imagine, I think, that they may induce us to claim new concessions to Neutrals which would result in being a considerable restraint to our assertion for ourselves of Belligerent rights if we should become involved in war". Lord Newton, *Lord Lyons*, I. 18.

<sup>15</sup> Adm. 1/5759. P. 249.

<sup>16</sup> Adm. 1/5820. P. 435, Milne to Admiralty, Aug. 1, 1863. Cf. Moore, *Digest*, VII. 852-854.

<sup>17</sup> Adm. 1/5851, Layard to Admiralty, Aug. 31, 1863. In 1864 the United States abandoned its earlier attitude for one approximating to the British position. Adm. 1/5871. P. 114, Lyons to Milne, Feb. 23, 1864.

In the memoranda which Milne left for his successor, on relinquishing command of the squadron, March 15, 1864, he summed up his experience with the blockade, and pointed out that the American doctrine as to the deposit of liability for breach of blockade was less stringent than that held by the law officers of the Crown:

In the earlier stages of the war I was ordered to report on the efficiency of the Blockades, but latterly this has become unnecessary, as it would seem that a sufficient number of vessels is kept off all the principal ports in the possession of the Confederates to render access to them dangerous to the now regularly organised blockade runners. . . . [The principal places of resort of the latter, he pointed out, were Bermuda and Nassau] . . . where they receive the cargo brought over from England and land their Cotton to be taken home by the same ships and thus by a real or nominal change of ownership or by some other expedient the cargoes which have succeeded in getting through the Blockades escape the risk to which the Crown say they would be liable even if transferred to another vessel so long as the cargo has not reached its destination, this rule however the United States Cruisers have not acted up to nor is it mentioned in the Instructions to their Cruisers in the Gulf which appeared in the Newspapers. . . .<sup>18</sup>

Throughout the war the problem of imperial defense in the event of hostilities with the United States was one of grave concern. On receipt of a despatch from Lyons, dated June 10, 1861, stating that he did not "regard a sudden declaration of war against us by the United States as an event altogether impossible at any moment", Milne sent a hurried warning to his scattered cruisers, and asked the Admiralty for reinforcements, deplored the wretched state of the defenses in the West Indies, where the forts and batteries at Jamaica were "works badly contrived and worse executed—unserviceable guns—decayed gun carriages—corroded shot—the absence of stores of all kinds and of ammunition, with delapidated and damp powder magazines".<sup>19</sup> The British government, which was sternly protesting against the act of July 13, 1861, authorizing the President to proclaim the closure of the Confederate ports,<sup>20</sup> reinforced Milne, but instructed him:

not to take any steps which might involve this Country in hostilities with the United States of America without further instructions. It is very probable that the President of the United States, upon receiving the communications already sent by the Governments of Great Britain and France to Lord Lyons and M. Mercier, may refrain from exercising the powers entrusted to him by Congress. But at all events H.M.'s Govt may expect

<sup>18</sup> Adm. 1/5871. P. 132; cf. Adm. 1/5799, Hammond to Admiralty, Nov. 1, 1862. See, however, Moore, *Digest*, VII. 839-840.

<sup>19</sup> Adm. 1/5759. P. 489, Milne to Admiralty, June 27, 1861.

<sup>20</sup> The best account of these negotiations is in E. D. Adams, *Great Britain and the American Civil War*, I. 246-252.

some explanations, and the friendly relations of Her Majesty and the United States are too important to be endangered by any chance collision or any premature action.<sup>21</sup>

In accord with these instructions Milne took precautions to prevent the adoption, by any of his subordinates, "of any measure likely to lead to a collision between any of H.M. Ships and those of the United States, while the question of the *Trent* was under the consideration of H.M.'s Govt.". <sup>22</sup>

Since the publication of Dasent's *Life of Delane* in 1908, historians have assumed that the British law officers gave an opinion on November 11 justifying, in advance of the news, the action of Wilkes in taking Mason and Slidell from the *Trent*, and then changed their views after the news of the actual event had aroused public opinion to fury.<sup>23</sup> Dasent published a letter from Palmerston to Delane, editor of the *Times*, dated November 11, in which the Prime Minister reported a conference that day with the law officers from which "much to my regret, it appeared that, . . . this American cruiser might, by our own principles of international law, stop the West Indian packet, search her, and if the Southern men and their dispatches and credentials were found on board, either take them out, or seize the packet and carry her back to New York for trial".<sup>24</sup> The written opinion of the law officers, however, dated November 12, which is published in full for the first time in the document section of this issue of the *Review*, stated explicitly that "The United States' ship of war may put a prize-crew on board the West India steamer, and carry her off to a port of the United States for adjudication by a Prize Court there; but she would have no right to remove Messrs. Mason and Slidell, and carry them off as prisoners, leaving the ship to pursue her voyage". It is clear that either the law officers changed their minds on what proved to be the crucial point, between their

<sup>21</sup> Adm. 1/5768, Russell to Admiralty, July 27, 1861.

<sup>22</sup> Adm. 1/5787, P. 13, Milne to Admiralty, Jan. 2, 1862. "It is my own deliberate conviction, as well as that of H.M. Minister at Washington, that pending the receipt of special orders from H.M. Govt. it is more consonant with our Instructions that we remain perfectly passive in the matter . . . questions as to how far our National Honour may be compromised by any undue exercise of Belligerent Rights by either party in respect to our *Merchant Vessels*,—in which Category are the Mail Steamers,—upon the high Seas, tho' of, I admit, very grave importance, are rather of a class to be determined on by H.M. Govt. than to be resented on the spot by H.M. Officers. . . ." *Ibid.*, Milne to Commodore Dunlop, senior officer, Jamaica Division, Dec. 7, 1861.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, C. F. Adams, "The *Trent* Affair", in Mass. Hist. Soc. *Proceedings*, XLV, 54-59; and E. D. Adams, *op. cit.*, I, 206-212.

<sup>24</sup> Arthur I. Dasent, *Life of John T. Delane*, II, 36; cf. *Letters of Queen Victoria*, ed. A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, III, 593. Palmerston to Queen Victoria, Nov. 13, 1861.

oral statement of November 11 and their written opinion dated the following day, or else, as seems more probable, Palmerston misunderstood their oral opinion of November 11 as to the right of removing the Confederate envoys. In any event, the oft-repeated charge that the law officers changed their minds on this point after the arrival on November 27 of news of the seizure, is clearly disproved.<sup>25</sup>

Through the month of December, 1861, the British government made hasty preparations for war, despatching additional troops to Canada, reinforcing Milne, and sending numerous additional cruisers to those sea lanes where American privateers might find their richest prizes. The principal danger spots were deemed to be the neighborhood of the Cape of Good Hope, St. Helena and Ascension and the track of homeward bound vessels near those islands, the immediate neighborhood of the Falkland Islands, and the space between the Southeast and Northeast Trades between the longitudes of 20° and 40°.<sup>26</sup> Sir Thomas Maitland, commanding the squadron on the west coast of North America, was to protect British communications with the Isthmus of Panama, and interrupt those of the enemy.<sup>27</sup> To some suggestions from Russell as to Milne's operations,<sup>28</sup> the Admiralty replied that it did not "at present consider it advisable to fetter him by any detailed instructions", but that Milne "should give his particular attention to the measures that may be necessary for the protection of the valuable trade between America, the West Indies, and England".<sup>29</sup>

Milne proposed that Commodore Dunlop, commanding the Jamaica Division, should, in the event of war, leave "the comparatively unimportant Mexican question to be decided by our Allies", and

forthwith proceed to take in detail the several Blockading Squadrons off Texas, the mouths of the Mississippi, Mobile, Pensacola, etc. or if the United States should, as is more than likely, have abandoned the Blockades and united all their Gulf Ships, the force at the disposal of the Commodore may I trust prove sufficient to enable him to capture them or prevent their return to the Atlantic Coast, to form a junction with the other Blockading Squadrons, which I should use every exertion to inter-

<sup>25</sup> Cf. the law officers' opinions of Nov. 12 and 28, in the document section. The older version of the first opinion, given in Walpole's *Russell*, II. 355, is now seen to be correct.

<sup>26</sup> Adm. 1/5766, draft of instructions to Rear-Admiral Warren, Dec. 7, 1861; Adm. 3/269, separate minute of instructions to Sir Baldwin Walker.

<sup>27</sup> Adm. 3/269, separate minute of instructions to Sir Thomas Maitland, Dec. 16, 1861.

<sup>28</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 5", p. 4.

<sup>29</sup> Adm. 1/5768, separate minute, Dec. 1, 1861.

cept so soon as possible and prevent their entrance into the Chesapeake.<sup>30</sup> In 1864 Milne stated that, if war had resulted from the *Trent* affair, his

own idea at the time was to have secured our own bases especially Bermuda and Halifax, raised the blockade of the Southern Ports by means of the squadron then at Mexico under the orders of Commodore Dunlop and that which I had with me at Bermuda and then to have immediately blockaded as effectually as my means admitted the chief Northern Ports, and to have acted in Chesapeake Bay in co-operation with the Southern Forces who would practically, if not in terms, have been our allies, and where our aid would have been invaluable. . . .<sup>31</sup>

Thanks to the decision of the American government to yield, a British frigate received the surrender of the Confederate envoys at Provincetown. Milne had tactfully issued instructions that "no display of feeling by cheering or otherwise is to be permitted when these Gentlemen are received from the U. S. authorities. . . . These gentlemen should not be recognized in any public capacity, but simply as private Gentlemen—Guests at the Captain's table".<sup>32</sup>

In the expectation that Confederate and Federal cruisers would soon seek the waters near the British Isles to destroy and protect Northern commerce, Earl Russell requested the Admiralty on January 13, 1862, to organize regular cruising in the English and St. George's channels, to protect British merchant ships from undue molestation. Lest this cruising force interfere with the lawful rights of belligerents, however, he asked the Admiralty to issue stringent instructions, based on the opinions given by the law officers on November 12 and 28.<sup>33</sup> When the Lords of the Admiralty had completed their draft, they looked on their work and found it bad. In the light of the subsequent developments of the doctrine of continuous voyage the protest of the Admiralty against the latitude which the law officers' opinions gave to belligerent rights, is worthy of record. The Admiralty

consider that it is not in accordance with Admiralty Law that a cruiser of a Foreign State, even after a declaration of War, should do more than exercise a right of visit to ascertain the nationality and destination of the vessel arrested, and that, when it is ascertained that she is a Merchant Ship of a neutral power proceeding from one neutral Port to another, no ground of detention or capture can arise.

My Lords consider that the case of a Packet carrying the mails for HM's Govt. is even stronger, and that, the nationality and destination being in this case undoubted, no Mail Bag or Packet however addressed

<sup>30</sup> Adm. 1/5787. P. 12, Milne to Admiralty, Dec. 25, 1861.

<sup>31</sup> Adm. 1/5871. P. 132, memoranda for Sir James Hope, Mar. 15, 1864.

<sup>32</sup> Adm. 1/5787. P. 23.

<sup>33</sup> Adm. 1/5798, Russell to Admiralty, Jan. 13.

should be opened—and that no question of contraband can arise in the case of a Vessel proceeding from one neutral Port to another neutral Port. . . .<sup>34</sup>

In opposition to the views of the law officers, the Admiralty proposed that British cruisers should be instructed, if present when a packet carrying British mail between two neutral ports was visited by a Federal or Confederate cruiser, to permit no further interference with her than was necessary to ascertain her nationality and destination. Faced with this sharp clash of opinion Russell decided on January 17 to withdraw this correspondence with the Admiralty, and let the matter stand over.<sup>35</sup>

These thorny problems, however, were not easily shelved. Extensions of the doctrine of continuous voyage continued to shock the legal sense of Admiral Milne, and to force the British government to consider how far it was wise to protest against developments destined, in a later and greater war, to prove of inestimable advantage to British sea power. On January 18 the Admiralty ordered Milne not to "interfere with any belligerent operations which may be carried on by either party beyond the limit of 3 miles from the Shore of any British possession although those operations might be attended with annoyance and inconvenience to the trade of British Ports".<sup>36</sup> In his long despatch of August 2 to Stuart, the British chargé at Washington, which elicited the revised instructions of August 18, 1862, to American naval vessels, Milne nevertheless protested against the seizure of British ships bound to British ports, and expressed a fear lest a collision between British and Federal ships of war might be the result.<sup>37</sup> While approving this despatch, the Admiralty referred Milne to their instructions of January 18, and observed that British officers who were compelled to use force to resist the violation of British territorial waters, should "use the utmost care . . . that no question should arise as to their acting within the limits of British territory".<sup>38</sup> Milne consequently issued instructions to his subordinates: "Until further orders, in the event of your witnessing the capture of British ships, *bona fide* trading

<sup>34</sup> Adm. 1/5798, Romaine to Hammond, Jan. 16, with draft of letter to port admirals.

<sup>35</sup> Adm. 1/5798, Hammond to Romaine, Jan. 17, private. Cf. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 5", pp. 33-37; Russell to Lyons, Jan. 23, 1862; and Mass. Hist. Soc., *Proceedings*, XLV. 137, Argyll to Adams, Jan. 25, 1862.

<sup>36</sup> Adm. 13/31, No. 47 M. On Aug. 8, 1862, Milne issued instructions based on these orders. Adm. 1/5872, P. 269.

<sup>37</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1863, vol. LXXII., "North America, no. 5", p. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Adm. 1/5796, Aug. 22, 1862, confidential.

from one neutral port to another, but not within British waters, you are not to use force."<sup>39</sup>

Following the views of the Admiralty rather than the law officers' opinions of November 12 and 28, the British government had extracted from Seward satisfactory assurances as to the treatment of neutral mails.<sup>40</sup> Shortly afterwards, hearing a rumor that Admiral Wilkes had expressed the intention of capturing the English packet from St. Thomas to Halifax in case he found on board her certain Confederate officers, Milne for once issued an order which the Admiralty saw fit to countermand. On December 5, 1862, he gave to Captain Glassee, senior officer at Bermuda, the following confidential instructions: "In the event of the Mail Steamer from St. Thomas to Halifax being detained by any Federal Cruizer, you will demand her instant release; and should this not be acceded to, you will avail yourself of the force under your orders to recapture her, as I cannot anticipate her having committed any act to warrant such a measure on the part of a Federal Cruizer."<sup>41</sup> After referring this instruction to the Foreign Office, the Admiralty ordered Milne to revoke it, on the ground that "although the seizure of the Packet would be an extreme use of Belligerent Rights and would justify the British Government in demanding reparation from the Federal Government, yet it would not justify an Officer in the use of Force to resist the capture or to recapture the packet in the open Sea . . .".<sup>41a</sup> When Lord Lyons called the attention of Seward to the alleged threat, Secretary Welles lost no time in directing Wilkes not to carry it out.<sup>42</sup>

From the outset Milne had sought to minimize friction with American commanders by a firm but conciliatory policy. As early as May 25, 1861, Lyons had warned him not to "count much upon a disposition on the part of this Govt. or its Officers to pay scrupulous respect to our Neutral Rights and neutral position, or, to abstain from provoking language or even aggressive conduct". British

<sup>39</sup> Adm. 1/5872, P. 269, *Nile*, at Halifax, Sept. 9, 1862. The writer will give a more extended treatment of the doctrine of continuous voyage, with special reference to the Matamoras cases, in the *Am. Jour. of Int. Law*.

<sup>40</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1863, vol. LXXII., "North America, no. 5". See also the report of Seward to Lincoln, Apr. 24, 1863, printed in part in the document section. The writer will discuss the treatment of neutral mails more fully in the *Am. Jour. of Int. Law*.

<sup>41</sup> Adm. 1/5788, P. 867, Milne to Glassee, Dec. 5, confidential, copy transmitted by Milne to Admiralty, Dec. 27, no. 996.

<sup>41a</sup> Adm. 1/5832, Feb. 2, 1863; cf. Adm. 1/5819, P. 100, Milne to Admiralty, Feb. 25, 1863, stating that he had since had reason to believe that "even if the threat had been made by Adm'l Wilkes, it would not have been carried into execution . . .".

<sup>42</sup> *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1863, pt. I., pp. 465-467. Wilkes denied the report. *Ibid.*, p. 502.

officers would, he trusted, still find American officers and civil authorities inclined to treat them, as individuals, with the same courtesy and friendliness which the British had always desired to respond to and to foster. Nevertheless, "in the present excited state of public sentiment, an officer of the U. S. is under considerable temptation to obtain for himself popular applause by violent proceedings against Great Britain, and we cannot but remember that even in quiet times the Govt. of the U. S. has rarely dared to brave popular clamour in order to repress aggressive acts committed by its officers against Foreign Nations".<sup>43</sup> Many of the volunteer officers of the United States Navy were ignorant of the usages and amenities of the sea, and some regular officers showed more zeal than legal knowledge. Chasing a rich prize inshore near the Bahamas, some commanders turned a blind eye to the limits of British territorial waters. Protests from Milne on May 29, and August 2, 1862, had elicited the revised instructions of August 18, 1862, to American cruisers, which did much to diminish friction.<sup>44</sup> The appointment of Acting Rear-Admiral Wilkes to the command of the West India Squadron on September 8, 1862, however, ushered in a period of tense feeling between the British and American naval forces in Southern waters.

The assignment of Wilkes to command a special squadron to protect American commerce in the West Indies and Bahamas from attacks by the *Florida* and *Alabama* was highly questionable. In this command the captor of Mason and Slidell had to deal with British officers and civil authorities whose memories of the *Trent* affair were still fresh. Welles deemed Wilkes efficient, but rash, inconsiderate, arbitrary, and one of the most unpopular officers in the service.<sup>45</sup> The Northern press and Northern shipowners, however, were denouncing the Navy Department for its failure to give adequate protection to American commerce, and Wilkes was still a popular idol.

Wilkes failed to catch the *Florida* and *Alabama*, and got into difficulties with the governments of Great Britain, Denmark, Mexico, and Spain, which led to his recall on June 1, 1863.<sup>46</sup> The sorry tale

<sup>43</sup> Adm. 1/5767, Lyons to Milne, May 25, 1861, copy, confidential, enclosed in Hammond to Admiralty, June 11, 1861.

<sup>44</sup> Adm. 1/5787. P. 355, copy of Milne to Lyons, May 29, 1862; *Parliamentary Papers*, 1863, vol. LXXII., "North America, no. 5", pp. 1-4; *O.R.N.*, first ser., I. 417-418.

<sup>45</sup> Welles Papers, in the Library of Congress, vol. I., Welles to Mrs. Welles, July 20, 1862; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I. 322-323. Wilkes's instructions are in *O.R.N.*, first ser., I. 470.

<sup>46</sup> *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I. 322-323. Wilkes's correspondence while in command of the West India squadron is in *O.R.N.*, first ser., vols. I. and II.

of his misunderstandings with British commanders and civil authorities, by no means entirely his own fault, fills many pages of the published diplomatic correspondence for 1863.<sup>47</sup> Except for his instructions to Glasse to protect the mail-packets, which the Admiralty revoked, Milne handled this difficult situation with consummate tact. On his squadron, whose officers were for the most part Southern sympathizers,<sup>48</sup> he kept a tight rein, meting out praise for conciliatory treatment of the belligerents, and stern censure for indiscreet or unneutral conduct.<sup>49</sup> When Seward and Lyons had finally smoothed away most of the difficulties in private conversations,<sup>50</sup> Milne handsomely closed the controversy by writing to Lyons, for communication to the American government, that "the officers in command under my orders have almost invariably reported to me that they have met with every attention and courtesy from the United States officers with whom they have fallen in, in spite of the efforts made by a portion of the press to create an ill feeling between them".<sup>51</sup> He pointed out to the Admiralty, in May, 1863, the "perfect courtesy which" Wilkes "evinced throughout towards Captain Vansittart, and with which he has equally treated every Naval Officer under my orders, with whom he has come in personal contact in the West Indies . . .".<sup>52</sup>

Frequently Milne gave instruction in international law to his own subordinates. When Commander Hickley of the *Greyhound* interfered with the exercise of the belligerent right of search which was being exercised by U.S.S. *Adirondack* more than five and a half miles from shore, Milne censured him and issued a circular warning his officers against the erroneous impression, then prevalent at Nas-

<sup>47</sup> *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1863, pt. I., pp. 408-409, 415-417, 420-421, 427-428, 435-436, 438-439, 440-443, 449, 452, 465-467, 475, 506, 508, 512.

<sup>48</sup> Stated to the writer by Admiral Sir William Henderson, K.B.E., whose kind help and encouragement have greatly aided this investigation; cf. Semmes, *Service Afloat*, p. 315.

<sup>49</sup> He rebuked Captain Malcolm of the *Barracouta* for asking injudiciously an American consul to inform Wilkes that if he anchored in British waters without permission and refused to move, "so certainly would I fire into him whatever his force might be" (Adm. 1/5788. P. 872, Malcolm to Milne, Nov. 24, Milne to Malcolm, Dec. 16, 1862). He twice censured that ardent Southern sympathizer, Commander Watson of the *Peterel*, and transferred his ship from the Southern coast to the Barbados division (Adm. 1/5787. P. 570, Milne to Admiralty, Aug. 14, 1862; Adm. 1/5819. P. 199, Milne to Admiralty, Mar. 20, 1863). See also Milne's censure of the conveyance of Confederate officers from Nassau to Bermuda in H.M.S. *Bulldog*. Adm. 12/733. 52-25, May 14, 1863.

<sup>50</sup> Adm. 1/5819. P. 34; Adm. 1/5850, Hammond to Admiralty, Feb. 18, 1863, enclosing copy of Lyons to Russell, Jan. 30, confidential.

<sup>51</sup> *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1863, pt. I., p. 475.

<sup>52</sup> Adm. 1/5819. P. 312, Milne to Admiralty, May 23, 1863. Cf. Hansard, third ser., CLXXI. 885.

sau, that improved gunnery, by extending the range of shot, had extended territorial limits beyond the recognized marine league.<sup>53</sup> When H.M.S. *Ariadne* convoyed the English steamer *Ruby*, which had been employed as a blockade runner, Milne at once put a stop to proceedings so dangerous to belligerent rights and to the interests of British sea power. In August, 1863, he issued instructions that "as convoy does not render the neutral convoyed less amenable to all the belligerent rights of visit, search, detention, or capture, no advantages at all commensurate with the risk of possible collision would follow, if afforded, and therefore all requests for convoy by Her Majesty's ships are to be refused".<sup>54</sup> When H.M.S. *Vesuvius* carried a shipment of specie from the blockaded port of Mobile, on the ground that it was certified by the British consul to be British property, Milne sternly censured her commander and issued a circular pointing out that "communication by neutral ships of war with a blockaded port is *permissive* only, and to be regarded as a relaxation of the more rigid rule of war which formerly obtained, and which would probably be again reverted to in a great maritime war; and further, that ships of war so communicating are not invested with a shadow of right to embark any property with the object of passing the blockade".<sup>55</sup>

Concerning the operations of the Federal cruisers near the Bahamas, Milne reported that he was not

disposed to scrutinize too minutely proceedings dictated by a natural and not unreasonable anxiety to check the vast contraband trade of which these Islands are the focus . . . until I am specially instructed to the contrary, I shall act up to what I conceive to be the spirit though not perhaps the very letter of Her Majesty's Instructions in not seeking occasion to interfere with their use of out of the way cays as places of rendezvous, or for the purpose of procuring supplies from them, yet of course no exercise of Belligerent rights, such as visit, search, detention or capture, can on any account be permitted within British Waters, nor must our Islands be made use of as places from whence to watch for passing vessels. . . .<sup>56</sup>

On the question of continuing the repair of "certain notorious Blockade Runners" in the government dockyard at Bermuda, Milne won a hard-fought victory over the queen's advocate, Sir Robert Phillimore. The latter argued that no belligerent government would

<sup>53</sup> Adm. 1/5788. P. 624, no. 642, Milne to Admiralty, Aug. 14, 1862, enclosing a copy of Milne to Hickley, Aug. 8; Adm. 1/5872. P. 269, Aug. 8, Oct. 13, 1862.

<sup>54</sup> Adm. 1/5872. P. 269, Aug. [15], 1863; Adm. 1/5819. P. 312, Milne to Admiralty, May 23, 1863, and enclosures.

<sup>55</sup> Adm. 1/5872. P. 269, Feb. 16, 1863. Printed with some errors in *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1863, pt. I., p. 474.

<sup>56</sup> Adm. 1/5788. P. 876, no. 995, Milne to Admiralty, Dec. 24, 1862.

have a legal right to expect a neutral government "to exclude from the general privilege of repair in the Dock Yards (of which too its own vessels, in this instance partake) a particular class of British vessels which they alleged to be, or which were commonly reported to be, what are called blockade-runners". The admiral might make a sparing use of his power to exclude from the privilege vessels which, after being repaired in these docks, proceeded to break the blockade. The exaction from all vessels seeking repair, however, of a bond that they "shall not be engaged within 3 months, directly or indirectly, in the business of breaking the blockade", would be unneutral, for it would approach "too closely the Act of assisting one belligerent to maintain against another his blockade . . .".<sup>57</sup> The Admiralty promptly transmitted this view to Milne, with instructions that "when repairs are asked for which are absolutely necessary for the safety of the ship, or to enable her to continue her voyage, they should be executed, whenever they do not interfere with the public service. A British merchantman should not be allowed to remain helpless at the island, merely because she has been or may again be engaged in attempting to run the blockade of the Southern ports . . .".<sup>58</sup>

Without questioning Phillimore's statement of the law of the case, Milne urged the Admiralty to reconsider on grounds of policy. He pointed out that:

the United States Government and People not unnaturally consider that the unhappy strife in which they are engaged would long since have been brought to an end, had it not been for the activity of the Blockade Runners, and hence they watch with feverish anxiety all intelligence of their movements; and although . . . it is not any part of our duty as a Neutral to stop this Trade, it may yet be found that the Federal Government is only waiting a good opportunity of drawing the distinction between merely *permitting* such a Trade, and actually aiding in it, by repairing, in Her Majesty's Naval Yards, Vessels openly, notoriously, and regularly engaged in this Fraudulent Trade, in direct defiance of Her Majesty's Proclamation, and thus enabling the Vessels, when disabled, to resume with greater expedition their adventurous and profitable traffic, and work the more injury to the Federal cause; and I confess it strikes me that our strict neutrality is far more likely to be jeopardized by repairing these Vessels under such circumstances, than in refraining to do so.

Most of the steamers in question, Milne declared, were well known to be running regularly between Bermuda or Nassau and Wilming-

<sup>57</sup> Adm. 1/5901, Phillimore to Russell, Jan. 14, copy enclosed in Hammond to Admiralty, Jan. 16, 1864. Cf. Adm. 1/5821, P. 704, Milne to Admiralty, Dec. 2, 1863, no. 750.

<sup>58</sup> Adm. 1/5901, draft of Admiralty to Milne, Jan. 17, 1864.

ton. If high enough wages were paid, their masters might effect their repairs at St. George's instead of at the government yard, whose resources were already heavily taxed by the naval forces.<sup>59</sup>

These arguments of the man on the spot prevailed. Russell expressed entire agreement with Milne's views, and asked the Admiralty to issue instructions accordingly. Although the secretary to the Admiralty observed that the law officers did not agree with Milne's views that blockade running was a "fraudulent trade in direct defiance of" the Neutrality Proclamation, he forthwith directed that masters of blockade runners who asked for repairs in the government yards or for supplies from the government stores, should be told "that the means at the disposal of the Dockyard are limited and must be reserved for the use of H.M.'s Ships of War".<sup>60</sup>

When Milne transferred the command of his squadron to Sir James Hope on March 15, 1864, the Lords of the Admiralty, who had already prolonged his command one year beyond the usual term, expressed to him their great satisfaction at the sound judgment with which he had met the difficult problems which had confronted him, and the able manner in which he had carried out the instructions of the government for preserving a strict neutrality between the belligerents.<sup>61</sup> On a three-day visit to Washington in October, 1863, Milne had received a most cordial welcome from President Lincoln and the members of his Cabinet. Seward expressed to Lord Lyons the government's appreciation of "the just, liberal and courteous conduct of the Admiral" during his command of the British squadron. Lyons reported to Russell that "the members of the Govt. seemed anxious to show that they were not unaware that to nothing more than to the excellent judgment and to the firm and conciliatory conduct of the Admiral is owing the maintenance of harmonious relations between the two Countries".<sup>62</sup>

His successor, Admiral Hope, fresh from his gallant service in the Far East, found his new command uneventful. In carrying out the government's policy of strict neutrality on the lines Milne had laid down, he attempted two innovations which failed to meet with the Admiralty's approval. On learning of the destruction by the

<sup>59</sup> Adm. 1/5871, P. 66, Feb. 11, 1864.

<sup>60</sup> Adm. 1/5901, Hammond to Admiralty, Mar. 8, 1864, note initialed by Romaine, Mar. 9; Adm. 13/34, no. 66 M., Romaine to Hope, Mar. 11.

<sup>61</sup> Adm. 3/271, special minute, Apr. 8, 1864.

<sup>62</sup> Welles Papers, vol. LV., Welles to Edgar T. Welles, Oct. 11, 1863; Adm. 1/5820, P. 545, Milne to Admiralty, Oct. 13; Adm. 1/5852, Hammond to Admiralty, Nov. 2, enclosing copy of Lyons to Russell, Oct. 16; Adm. 1/5901, Hammond to Admiralty, Jan. 2, 1864, enclosing copies of Lyons to Seward, Nov. 30, and Seward to Lyons, Dec. 3. Cf. *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I. 467-469.

*Alabama* of the bark *Martaban*, recently transferred from American to British registry and sailing under the British flag, Hope ordered two of his officers to board the Confederate commerce destroyer *Florida* and exact from her commander a written pledge not to destroy British prizes without sending them before a prize court. If the Confederate officer refused to give the required pledge, his ship was to be excluded from British ports. If he had already destroyed an uncondemned British prize, his ship was to be captured and sent to England for adjudication, unless he gave a bond to the full value of the vessel and cargo destroyed. Lieutenant Charles M. Morris, commanding the *Florida*, gave the required written pledge, observing that he had been instructed by his government to let neutral vessels pass.<sup>63</sup> The Admiralty, however, countermanded Hope's orders, on the ground that "a neutral is not entitled to assume *a priori* that a belligerent will act contrary to international law; and still less to require security in the shape of an engagement against such a contingency". If a Confederate raider destroyed a British ship the proper remedy was diplomatic action by the British government.<sup>64</sup> Hope had no better success in his elaborate attempt to codify the separate instructions concerning international law which his predecessor had issued. The Admiralty objected that Milne's instructions "were all framed to meet particular cases, and the state of affairs existing at the time of their issue; and although the principles of international law on which they are based are no doubt generally applicable, it would not be safe in all cases to issue those instructions without a reference to the circumstances which called them forth".<sup>65</sup>

Historians have often discussed the causes of the increased efforts made by the British government, beginning in 1863, to prevent the fitting out of Confederate warships in the United Kingdom. Naval manuscripts from both sides of the water throw some fresh light on this problem.

Fear of the two double-turreted ironclad rams on Coles's system which the Lairds were building for the Confederates led the United States government to adopt the risky and abortive experiment of a secret purchase of these dangerous vessels. In December, 1862,

<sup>63</sup> Adm. 1/5872, P. 213, Hope to Admiralty, May 2, 1864; Adm. 1/5873, P. 340, *id.* to *id.*, June 21 and 30, 1864; cf. Adm. 1/5873, P. 502, *id.* to *id.*, Nov. 24, 1864.

<sup>64</sup> Adm. 1/5872, P. 290; Adm. 1/5902, Hammond to Admiralty, June 1, 1864; Adm. 13/35, nos. 236 M. and 250 M., Romaine to Hope, June 1 and 9, 1864.

<sup>65</sup> Adm. 1/5872, P. 269, Hope to Admiralty, Apr. 25, 1864, Admiralty to Foreign Office, June 8, 1864, draft of Admiralty to Hope, June, 1864; Adm. 1/5903, law officers to Russell, Aug. 12, copy enclosed in Hammond to Admiralty, Sept. 6, 1864.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox discussed this project with John Murray Forbes, stating that he and Welles favored the idea "and Mr. Seward simply urges it". When Seward declared that the British government wished the North "to come into their market for the purchase of vessels, that we may be put upon an equal footing with the South", Welles expressed doubts.<sup>66</sup> On December 12 the American consul in London, Freeman H. Morse, proposed to Seward that the United States press the British government "so hard for the seizure or detention of these war ships as to alarm the builders . . . and then have the right man step in at the right time to buy them out of confederate hands". He suggested that a friendly ship-broker buy the ships, as agent for some Russian, Italian, or other foreign house.<sup>67</sup> Seward transmitted this project to the Navy Department, December 29, asking Welles's views on this "important suggestion".<sup>68</sup> Welles objected that such a step might relieve Great Britain of her responsibility for the depredations of the *Alabama*, and stimulate British shipbuilders to construct more warships than the United States could buy.<sup>69</sup> Morse argued, none the less, that his proposal to buy the ships in Spanish or German ports would not weaken the American case against England for the fitting out of the *Alabama*.<sup>70</sup> Fox, who in 1861 had flirted with the idea of having Laird build ironclads for the North,<sup>71</sup> now sent an unofficial letter to Morse, which elicited a plan to buy these ships through an intermediary in Hamburg or Bremen.<sup>72</sup> Welles sent John Murray Forbes and W. H. Aspinwall to England on this wild scheme on March 16, with credits for £1,000,000 for the purchase of the ships. These discreet agents, finding conditions for purchase unpropitious, avoided all steps which might prejudice the American case.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>66</sup> *Letters and Recollections of John Murray Forbes*, I, 341-343, Fox to Forbes, Dec. 9 and 19, 1862.

<sup>67</sup> State Department, Consular Despatches, London, vol. XXX.

<sup>68</sup> Navy Department, Executive Letters, 1862, vol. VI.

<sup>69</sup> Navy Department, Executive Letter-Book no. 15, Welles to Seward, Jan. 2.

<sup>70</sup> Consular Despatches, London, vol. XXXI., Morse to Seward, Feb. 12, endorsed "send to Navy".

<sup>71</sup> See the writer's forthcoming book, *Introduction of the Ironclad Warship*.

<sup>72</sup> G. V. Fox MSS. in New York Historical Society, Fox to Morse, Feb. 6, Morse to Fox, Feb. 28. Cf. Consular Despatches, London, vol. XXXI., Morse to Seward, Mar. 13. Governor Andrew favored the purchase. Sumner MSS. in Harvard College Library, vols. LXII., LXIII., Andrew to Sumner, Feb. 12 and Mar. 18, 1863.

<sup>73</sup> *Letters and Recollections of John Murray Forbes*, II, 1-66; C. F. Adams, "An Historical Residuum", in *Studies Military and Diplomatic*. Though the American minister to England was designedly kept in ignorance of this mission, Professor E. D. Adams errs in describing it as "wholly a Navy Department plan". *Great Britain and the American Civil War*, II, 130 n.

The same manuscript collections bring into sharper relief the influence of threats of privateering on British policy in 1863.<sup>74</sup> From the outset of the war, suggestions for some sort of volunteer navy had rained upon the Navy Department.<sup>75</sup> Shipowners whose vessels could no longer meet British competition, and who had failed to sell their ships to the Navy Department, began to look into schemes for protecting American commerce at a profit. If the regular navy failed to capture the *Alabama*, why not invite private enterprise by offering a handsome sum for her capture or destruction? If the blockade of Wilmington left something to be desired, why not fill the gaps with volunteer ships, stimulated by generous offers of prize money? Seward's successful advocacy of the act of March 3, 1863, which authorized the President to issue letters of marque may have been simply a gesture to induce the British to prevent the sailing of the Confederate vessels under construction in the United Kingdom. On the other hand, there is some evidence that Seward, partly to conciliate certain speculative shipowners, wished that some letters of marque be actually issued.<sup>76</sup>

At all events the British government, though protesting against the policy of the measure, was fully prepared to admit its legality. Instructions of March, 1863, recognized the right of "a private ship of war, furnished with letters of marque or a commission of war, to capture neutral vessels carrying contraband of war, or violating a blockade". British warships which met a British merchantman, prize to a private ship lacking such letters of marque or commission on board, might set free the prize, using force if necessary.<sup>77</sup>

Desire to avoid the friction which would result from privateersmen aiding in the blockade may have contributed, as Professor E. D. Adams suggests, to the British decision to stop the Laird rams. Yet one may question whether the need to bar the way to the commissioning of American "*Alabamas*" when Great Britain was at war and

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Mass. Hist. Soc., *Proceedings*, XLVI, 81-84; and E. D. Adams, *op. cit.*, ch. XIII.

<sup>75</sup> Letters and Recollections of John Murray Forbes, I, 225, 227, 233; R. B. Forbes, *Personal Reminiscences*, pp. 285, 301; State Department, Despatches, Belgium, vol. V., Sanford to Seward, July 16, 1861; Fox MSS., J. J. Comstock to Fox, June 18 and 27, 1863; *Addresses and Resolutions of Gen. Hiram Walbridge* (New York).

<sup>76</sup> Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, pp. 145-164, and *Diary*, I, 246-261; Pierce, *Sunner*, IV, 120-122, 129-130; State Department, Miscellaneous Letters, Apr., 1863, pt. I., John B. Murray to Seward, Apr. 4 and 18, 1863. The regulations issued by the State Department on Mar. 20, and accompanying instructions, provided for the capture of neutral prizes, as well as Confederate vessels (MS. Circulars, I, 218-221). Howard's criticisms of the regulations bring out the financial side of the matter. State Department, Domestic Letters, vol. LX., Seward to Murray, Apr. 6, Seward to Welles, Apr. 20.

<sup>77</sup> Adm. 1/5850, Hammond to Admiralty, Mar. 28, 1863.

the United States neutral was not more influential. Zédé, a French naval constructor in charge of transatlantic steamers, who frequently visited England, reported to his government on June 2, 1863, a remarkable change in the opinion of British shipping circles on the subject of commerce-destroying. Earlier delight at the destruction of a rival's commerce, he observed, had been replaced by alarm at the ravages which ships like the *Alabama* might inflict on England when she was involved in war.<sup>78</sup> The memorial from the principal shipowners of Liverpool, on July 8, seeking amendments to the Foreign Enlistment Act, reflected this sentiment.<sup>79</sup> The London *Times* demanded that the sale of ships of war to a belligerent be declared plainly and indisputably unlawful, for if England were at war, "any Power with a little money or credit, however otherwise insignificant, might purchase in the ports of any maritime State a squadron sufficient to occupy a large portion of our navy".<sup>80</sup>

The British government had ample reason to see the force of this remark. If war came with Russia, might she not fit out "*Alabamas*" in American ports?<sup>81</sup> In 1863, moreover, England was on the brink of war with Japan. On August 12 Russell suggested to the Admiralty the occupation of the Bonin Islands in the event of hostilities.<sup>82</sup> A fortnight earlier Lousada, the British consul at Boston, reported that some of the leading merchants of that port had applied to the Japanese government for letters of marque, in case war broke out between Japan and Great Britain. Several of these shipowners had vessels operating in the China seas or trading from California to Japan, which might readily be transformed into commerce destroyers. Before this imaginary danger had vanished the Admiralty transmitted a gloomy report to the Foreign Office that the British force of gunboats and small steamers in the Far East would probably not be of sufficient force to capture such privateers;

<sup>78</sup> See the document section in this issue.

<sup>79</sup> *Parliamentary Papers*, 1863, vol. LXXII., "North America, no. 13". Cf. *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1862, pt. I., p. 237.

<sup>80</sup> Leaders of September 1, 3, and 10, 1863. Cf. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington", in *Lee at Appomattox*, pp. 42-43, 68-74. Significant of the change in British policy is the report of the law officers on the case of the *Rappahannock*, Dec. 10, 1863, printed in the document section. Cf. *Appendix to the British Case, Geneva Arbitration*, II. 611-674. For the British protest to the Confederate government, and its reception, see J. M. Callahan, *Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy*, p. 215.

<sup>81</sup> Milne wrote to the Admiralty, Oct. 18, 1863, that it was reported at New York that Admiral Lisovski's squadron there carried a large number of officers and men in excess of regular complements, with a view to manning other vessels to be purchased in the United States or elsewhere in event of war. Cf. F. A. Golder, "The Russian Fleet and the Civil War", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 801 ff.

<sup>82</sup> Adm. 1/5851, Layard to Admiralty, Aug. 12.

and Russell requested the despatch of some large vessels of war.<sup>53</sup>

Both as to neutral duties and as to neutral rights British policy seems in no small measure to have been dictated by the future interests of British sea power. Regardless of the sympathies of the majority of the governing classes, British policy as to neutral rights favored the North, because most precedents of the British past and the obvious interests of the empire in the future dictated decisions favoring belligerent pretensions. As to neutral duties, it was apparent in 1863 as in 1871 that British interests in the long run demanded the highest standards of neutral performance.

JAMES P. BAXTER, 3RD.

<sup>53</sup> Adm. 1/5851: Layard to Admiralty, Aug. 10 and 13, enclosing copies of Lousada to Russell, July 25; Lousada to Lyons, July 24; Lyons to Russell, July 28; Admiralty minute, Aug. 14, confidential; Layard to Admiralty, Aug. 18, 1863. Seward promised Lyons that the American authorities would be on the alert. State Department: Notes to Department, Great Britain, vol. LIV., memorandum of Aug. 12; Notes from Department, Great Britain, vol. X., memorandum of Aug. 14; Domestic Letters, vol. LXI., Seward to Bates, Aug. 14, 1863; Miscellaneous Letters, Aug., 1863, Bates to Seward, Aug. 18.

## THE CENTRAL THEME OF SOUTHERN HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

AN Ohio River ferryman has a stock remark when approaching the right bank: "We are nearing the American shore." A thousand times has he said it with a gratifying repercussion from among his passengers; for its implications are a little startling. The northern shore is American without question; the southern is American with a difference. Kentucky had by slender pretense a star in the Confederate flag; for a time she was officially neutral; for all time her citizens have been self-consciously Kentuckians, a distinctive people. They are Southerners in main sentiment, and so are Marylanders and Missourians.

Southernism did not arise from any selectiveness of migration, for the sort of people who went to Virginia, Maryland, or Carolina, were not as a group different from those who went to Pennsylvania or the West Indies. It does not lie in religion or language. It was not created by one-crop tillage, nor did agriculture in the large tend to produce a Southern scheme of life and thought. The Mohawk valley was for decades as rural as that of the Roanoke; wheat is as dominant in Dakota as cotton has ever been in Alabama; tobacco is as much a staple along the Ontario shore of Lake Erie as in the Kentucky pennyroyal; and the growing of rice and cotton in California has not prevented Los Angeles from being in a sense the capital of Iowa. On the other hand the rise of mill towns in the Carolina piedmont and the growth of manufacturing at Richmond and Birmingham have not made these Northern. It may be admitted, however, that Miami, Palm Beach, and Coral Gables are Southern only in latitude. They were vacant wastes until Flagler, Fifth Avenue, and the realtors discovered and subdivided them.

The South has never had a focus. New York has plied as much of its trade as Baltimore or New Orleans; and White Sulphur Springs did not quite eclipse all other mountain and coast resorts for vacation patronage. The lack of a metropolis was lamented in 1857 by an advocate of Southern independence,<sup>2</sup> as an essential for shaping and radiating a coherent philosophy to fit the prevailing conditions of life. But without a consolidating press or pulpit or other definite apparatus the South has maintained a considerable solidarity

<sup>1</sup> This article is to form the basis of a discussion at the meeting of the American Historical Association at Indianapolis. See *Historical News*.

<sup>2</sup> *Russell's Magazine* (Charleston), I. 106.

through thick and thin, through peace and war and peace again. What is its essence? Not state rights—Calhoun himself was for years a nationalist, and some advocates of independence hoped for a complete merging of the several states into a unitary Southern republic; not free trade—sugar and hemp growers have ever been protectionists; not slavery—in the eighteenth century this was of continental legality, and in the twentieth it is legal nowhere; not Democracy—there were many Federalists in Washington's day and many Whigs in Clay's; not party predominance by any name, for Virginia, Georgia, and Mississippi were "doubtful states" from Jackson's time to Buchanan's. It is not the land of cotton alone or of plantations alone; and it has not always been the land of "Dixie", for before its ecstatic adoption in 1861 that spine-tingling tune was a mere "walk around" of Christie's minstrels. Yet it is a land with a unity despite its diversity, with a people having common joys and common sorrows, and, above all, as to the white folk a people with a common resolve indomitably maintained—that it shall be and remain a white man's country. The consciousness of a function in these premises, whether expressed with the frenzy of a demagogue or maintained with a patrician's quietude, is the cardinal test of a Southerner and the central theme of Southern history.

It arose as soon as the negroes became numerous enough to create a problem of race control in the interest of orderly government and the maintenance of Caucasian civilization. Slavery was instituted not merely to provide control of labor but also as a system of racial adjustment and social order. And when in the course of time slavery was attacked, it was defended not only as a vested interest, but with vigor and vehemence as a guarantee of white supremacy and civilization. Its defenders did not always take pains to say that this was what they chiefly meant, but it may nearly always be read between their lines, and their hearers and readers understood it without overt expression.<sup>3</sup> Otherwise it would be impossible to account for the fervid secessionism of many non-slaveholders and the eager service of thousands in the Confederate army.

<sup>3</sup> Many expressions were explicit, for example, the remarks of Mr. Standard at Richmond in 1829: "The property we seek to protect . . . is not mere brute matter . . . but it consists of intelligent, sentient, responsible beings, that have passions to be inflamed, hearts to feel, understandings to be enlightened, and who are capable of catching the flame of enthusiasm from the eloquent effusions of agitators . . . ; and who may not only be lost to their masters as property, but may change conditions and become masters themselves, so far at least as the ravages of a servile war shall have [error for leave] any subject to be ruled over," *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention of 1829-30* (Richmond, 1830), p. 306.

The non-slaveholders of course were diverse in their conditions and sentiments. Those in the mountains and the deep pine woods were insulated to such degree that public opinion hardly existed, and they chose between alternatives only when issues created in other quarters were forced upon them. Those in the black belts, on the other hand, had their lives conditioned by the presence of the negroes; and they had apparatus of court days, militia musters, and political barbecues as well as neighborhood conversation to keep them abreast of affairs. A mechanic of Iuka, Mississippi, wrote in the summer of 1861: "I am a Georgian Raised I am Forty years Old A tinner By Trade I Raised the First Confederate Flag that I Ever Heard Of that was in 1851 in the Town of Macon Miss. Notwithstanding the Many Radicules I Encounter'd I Told the Citizens that they would All Be Glad to Rally under Such a Flag Some Day which is at present true."<sup>4</sup> This personal tale was told to prove his title to a voice in Confederate policy. His main theme was a demand that the permanent Confederate constitution exclude negroes from all employment except agricultural labor and domestic service in order that the handicrafts be reserved for white artisans like himself.

The overseer of a sugar estate forty miles below New Orleans inscribed a prayer on the plantation journal:

Thursday 13 June 1861

This Day is set a part By presedent Jefferson Davis for fasting and praying owing to the Deplorable condition ower southern country is In My Prayer Sincerely to God is that every Black Republican in the Hole combined whorl eith'er man woman o chile that is opposed to negro slavery as it existed in the Southern confederacy shal be trubled with pestilents and calamitys of all Kinds and Drag out the Balance of there existance in Misray and Degradation with scarsely food and rayment enough to keep sole and Body to gather and o God I pray the to Direct a bullet or a bayonet to pirc The Hart of every northern soldier that invades southern soile and after the Body has rendered up its traterish sole gave it a trators reward a Birth In the Lake of Fires and Brimstone my honest convicksion is that every man wome and chile that has gave aide to the abolitionist are fit subjects for Hell I all so ask the to aide the southern Confederacy in maintaining ower rites and establishing the confederate Government Believing this case the prares from the wicked will prevailleth much Amen<sup>5</sup>

This overseer's pencilled prayer is the most rampant fire-eating expression which I have encountered in any quarter. He and the tinner had an economic interest in the maintenance of slavery, the one to assure the presence of laborers for him to boss, the other to

<sup>4</sup> Manuscript letter in private possession.

<sup>5</sup> When I made this transcript twenty years ago the manuscript journal was on Magnolia plantation in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. The item is in the handwriting of J. A. Randall, overseer.

restrain competition in his trade. But both of them, and a million of their non-slaveholding like, had a still stronger social prompting: the white men's ways must prevail; the negroes must be kept innocuous.

In the 'forties when most of the planters were Whig some of the Democratic politicians thought it strange that their own party should be the more energetic in defense of slavery; and in 1860 they were perhaps puzzled again that the Bell and Everett Constitutional Union ticket drew its main support from among the slaveholders. The reason for this apparent anomaly lay doubtless in the two facts, that men of wealth had more to lose in any cataclysm, and that masters had less antipathy to negroes than non-slaveholders did. In daily contact with blacks from birth, and often on a friendly basis of patron and retainer, the planters were in a sort of partnership with their slaves, reckoning upon their good-will or at least possessing a sense of security as a fruit of long habituation to fairly serene conditions. But the white toilers lived outside this partnership and suffered somewhat from its competition. H. R. Helper in his *Impending Crisis* (1857) urged them to wreck the system by destroying slavery; and when this had been accomplished without their aid he vented in his fantastic *Nojouque* (1867) a spleen against the negroes, advocating their expulsion from the United States as a preliminary to their universal extermination. Thus he called for class war upon a double front, to humble the "lords of the lash" and then to destroy the "black and bi-colored caitiffs" who cumbered the white man's world. By his alliterative rhetoric and shrewdly selected statistics Helper captured some Northern propagandists and the historians whom they begat, but if he made any converts among Southern yeomen they are not of record. His notions had come to him during residence in California and the North; they were therefore to be taken skeptically. His programmes repudiated humane tradition, disregarded vital actualities, and evoked Northern aid to make over the South in its own image. These things, and perhaps the last especially, were not to be sanctioned. In fact, for reasons common in the world at large, the Southern whites were not to be divided into sharply antagonistic classes. Robert J. Walker said quite soundly in 1856:

In all the slave States there is a large majority of voters who are non-slaveholders; but they are devoted to the institutions of the South—they would defend them with their lives—and on this question the South are [*sic*] a united people. The class, composed of many small farmers, of merchants, professional men, mechanics, overseers, and other industrial classes, constitute mainly the patrol of the South, and cheerfully unite in carrying out those laws essential to preserve the institution. Against a

powerful minority and constant agitation slavery could not exist in any State.<sup>6</sup>

He wrote this to explain the poor prospect of slavery in Kansas; he might have used the same phrasing to explain its persistence in Delaware or Missouri. Habitat grouping, it is clear, had a cementing force great enough to overcome the cleaving tendency of economic stratification. So strong was it, indeed, that sundry free negroes gave warm endorsement to the project of Southern independence.<sup>7</sup>

It is perhaps less fruitful to seek the social classes at large which were warm and those which were cool toward independence than to inquire why the citizens of certain areas were prevailingly ardent while those in another zone were indifferent or opposed, why for example the whole tier from South Carolina to Texas seceded spontaneously but no other states joined them until after Lincoln's call for troops. The reason lay in preceding history as well as in current conditions. The economic factor of the cotton belt's interest in free trade and its recurrent chagrin at protective tariff enactments is by no means negligible. The rancor produced by nullification and the "force bill" had been revived in South Carolina by the repeal of the compromise tariff in 1842, and it did not then die. The quarrels of Georgia with the federal authorities over Indian lands, with Alabama and Mississippi looking on in interested sympathy, were contributing episodes to make the lower South alert; and the heavy negro proportions in their black belts, together with immaturity in the social order, made their people more sensitive than those of Virginia to the menace of disturbance from outside.

Slavery questions, which had never been quite negligible since the framing of the Constitution, gained a febrile activity from the abolition agitation; and the study of Congressional mathematics focussed the main attention upon the rivalry of the sections in territorial enlargement. The North had control of the lower house, as recurrent votes on the Wilmot Proviso showed; and California's admission upset the sectional equilibrium in the Senate. For Yancey, Rhett, and Quitman and for the pamphleteers Longstreet, Bryan, and Trescot, this was enough. The North now had the strength of a giant; the South should strike for independence before that strength should grow yet greater and be consolidated for crushing purposes. But the gestures of Cass, Webster, and Fillmore gave ground for hope that the giant would not use his power against Southern home rule, and the crisis was deferred. Southern friends and foes of the

<sup>6</sup> *DeBow's Review*, XXI. 591-592.

<sup>7</sup> U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, p. 436; R. H. Williams, *With the Border Ruffians* (London, 1908), p. 441.

Compromise of 1850 were alert thenceforward for tokens of Northern will. Events through the ensuing decade, somewhat assisted by the fire-eaters and culminating in a Republican's election to the Presidency, converted a new multitude to the shibboleth: "The alternative: a separate nationality or the Africanization of the South."<sup>8</sup>

Walter Lippmann has analyzed political process in general as if he had our present study specifically in mind:

Since the general opinions of large numbers of persons are almost certain to be a vague and confusing medley, action cannot be taken until those opinions have been factored down, canalized, compressed and made uniform. The making of one general will out of a multitude of general wishes . . . consists essentially in the use of symbols which assemble emotions after they have been detached from their ideas. . . . The process, therefore, by which general opinions are brought to co-operation consists in an intensification of feeling and a degradation of significance.<sup>9</sup>

The tension of 1850 had brought much achievement in this direction. "Southern rights" had come to mean racial security, self-determination by the whites whether in or out of the Union, and all things ancillary to the assured possession of these. Furthermore a programme had been framed to utilize state sovereignty whether to safeguard the South as a minority within the Union or to legitimate its exit into national independence.

The resurgence of these notions and emotions after their abeyance in 1851 need not be traced in detail. Suffice it to say that legal sanction for the spread of slaveholding, regardless of geographical potentialities, became the touchstone of Southern rights; and the rapid rise of the Republican party which denied this sanction, equally regardless of geographical potentialities, tipped the balance in lower Southern policy. Many were primed in 1856 for a stroke in case Frémont should be elected that year; and though he fell short of an electoral majority, the strength shown by his ticket increased the zeal of South-savers through the next quadrennium. The so-called Southern commercial conventions became a forum and *DeBow's Review* an organ for the airing of projects, mad or sane, for annexing Cuba, promoting direct trade with Europe, boycotting Northern manufactures and Northern colleges, procuring Southern text-books for Southern schools, reopening the African slave trade—anything and everything which might agitate and perhaps consolidate the South in a sense of bafflement within the Union and a feeling of separate destiny. Many clergymen gave their aid, particularly by praising slavery as a biblical and benevolent institution.

<sup>8</sup> The title of a pamphlet by William H. Holcombe, M.D. (New Orleans, 1860).

<sup>9</sup> *The Phantom Public* (New York, 1925), p. 47.

Pierre Soulé tried in 1857, as Calhoun had done eight years before, to create a Southern party separate from the Democrats;<sup>10</sup> and next year Yancey launched his League of United Southerners. Ere long a rural editor blurted what many must have been thinking:

That the North sectionalized will acquire possession of this Government at no distant day we look upon as no longer a matter of doubt. . . . It is inevitable. The South—the whole South even—cannot avert it. We may determine to fight the battle with our foes within the Union, . . . but we will fight only to be defeated. The Union of the South is indeed of great moment—not however for successful resistance in this Union, but for going out of it under circumstances the most favorable to the speedy formation of a separate and independent government.<sup>11</sup>

Various expressions in Northern papers, debates in Congress, and events in Kansas and elsewhere had fanned these flames when the stroke of John Brown fell upon Harper's Ferry. This event was taken as a demonstration that abolitionists had lied in saying they were concerned with moral suasion only, and it stimulated suspicion that Republicans were abolitionists in disguise. In December the South Carolina legislature when expressing sympathy with Virginia intimated that she was ripe for secession and invited all Southern states to meet in convention at once to concert measures for united action. In February the Alabama legislature asserted that under no circumstances would the commonwealth submit to "the foul domination of a sectional Northern party", and it instructed the governor in the event of a Republican's election to the Presidency to order the election of delegates to a convention of the state to consider and do whatever in its judgment her rights, interests, and honor might require.

There was little to do in the interim but discuss principles and portents and to jockey the situation slightly to prepare for the crisis or try to prevent it according to what individuals might think best. In an editorial of January 9, 1860, on "The true position of the South: Not aggrandisement but safety", the New Orleans *Crescent*, which was long an advocate of moderation, said:

The South does not claim the right of controlling the North in the choice of a President; she admits fully and explicitly that the Northern people possess the prerogative of voting as they please. But at the same time the South asserts that while the North holds the legal right of casting her voice as to her may seem best, she has no *moral* right to so cast it as to effect the ruin of the South; and if she does so cast it, in full view of its injurious effects upon us, . . . she, in effect, commits an act of covert hostility upon us that will render it impossible for us to live longer in intimate relations.

<sup>10</sup> New Orleans *Crescent*, June 17, 1857.

<sup>11</sup> The *Southern* (Orangeburg, S. C.), quoted in the *Southern Guardian* (Columbia, S. C.), May 20, 1859.

On April 15, the *Delta*, replying to a recent lecture at New Orleans by George D. Prentiss of Louisville, denied that Clay and Webster, "those demiurgic heroes of his political faith", could have sufficed for the present occasion:

The period of mere political formation is past, and the period for the solution of great social and industrial problems is at hand. Mere constitutional lore here can do nothing; mere skill in adjusting balances of political power can do nothing. Is it just to hold the negro in bondage? Is negro slavery inimical to the rights of white men? Is it best for both the white and black man—best for the interests of agriculture, best for the needs of commerce and useful arts, and best for social stability and civilization? These and kindred questions imperiously demand to be answered, and they are precisely the questions which the old school of statesmen strenuously refused to look in the face. . . . The truth is, we are in the midst of facts having a philosophy of their own which we must master for ourselves, leaving dead men to take care of the dead past. The Sphinx which is now propounding its riddles to us the dead knew nothing about; consequently no voice from the grave can tell us how to get rid of the monster.

After the nominating conventions had put four tickets in the field the newspapers began a running debate upon the relative merits of Douglas, Breckinridge, and Bell for Southern purposes and the degree of menace in the Lincoln candidacy. The Natchez *Free Trader*, which until June 27 mastheaded the names of Albert G. Brown and Fernando Wood, accepted next day the Richmond nominations:

We hoist today the flag of the Union-saving National Democratic nominees, Breckinridge and Lane, *sans peur et sans reproche*. With records so fair that none can attack them, they will win the hearts of all the people of the land, be elected by a vote so flattering as to cause the hearts of the noblest and best to beat with honest exaltation and pride, and so administer the Government as to have the blessings of the people showered on them and elicit the unrestrained admiration of an enlightened world.

Such bombast as this might survive the summer; but when the October elections brought a virtual certainty of Lincoln's election the discussion took another phase. The friends of each minor ticket demanded that the other two be withdrawn or forsaken. Douglas and Bell men agreed at least that Breckinridge ought to be abandoned. The Nashville *Union and American*, in reply on October 16 to such a demand from the Nashville *Patriot*, said that Breckinridge might still be elected by Southern concentration upon him, "in as much as it will prove to the North that we are determined to have our rights". And as a last appeal, November 6, the New Orleans *Delta* said, urging votes for Breckinridge as against Bell or Douglas:

Is this the time to indorse the representatives of a half-way, compromising, submissive policy? When the whole North is sectional shall the South be national, when nationality can mean nothing but an acquiescence in the employment of national means to accomplish sectional purposes? Never before in the history of any free and brave people was so bold a challenge as that which the North now throws at us received in any other way than the stern and proud defiance of a united and determined community.

Among the Bell organs the New Orleans *Bee* gave a remarkably sound analysis in an editorial of July 27: "The restlessness of the South touching the agitation of the slavery question arises rather from the apprehension of what the aggressive policy of the North may hereafter effect, than from what it has already accomplished. For . . . we may safely affirm that thus far no practical injury has resulted." The Southern failure in colonizing Kansas, it continued, was not a grievance, for: "prudent and far-seeing men predicted the utter impracticability of carrying the design into execution. . . . Slavery will go where it will pay. No slaveholder for the sake of an abstraction will amuse himself by earning five per cent in Kansas on the labor of his chattels, when with absolutely less toil it will give him fifteen per cent in the cotton or sugar fields of Louisiana." On its own score the *Bee* concluded: "We apprehend that the Black Republicans are dogs whose bark is more dangerous than their bite. The South is too precious to the North to be driven out of the Union." Its colleague the *Crescent* expressed a belief as late as October 20 that, if the Republican party should win the contest, its "unnatural and feverish vitality" would reach exhaustion within a year or two. In the United States thus far, the *Crescent* argued, parties had arisen and fallen in rapid succession.

But all of these parties were national. The principles they advocated were of common application to the whole country, and their members and adherents were found in every quarter and every State of the Union. If these parties were temporary and short-lived in their character and constitution, still more so must the Black Republican party be, sectional as it is in its organization and principles, and obnoxious to a deeper hatred and more bitter opposition than any other organization that has yet made its appearance in the political arena. It is impossible that such a party can long exist.

Just before election day George Fitzhugh of Virginia wrote to the Charleston *Mercury* a long letter concluding: "In the Union there is no hope for us. Let us gather courage from despair, and quit the Union." The editor when printing this, November 9, remarked: "Mr. Fitzhugh is a little excitable. We intend to 'quit the Union', but without any 'despair' whatever. We'll quit it with a round hip! hip! hurrah!!"

But now that the partizans of Breckinridge, Bell, and Douglas had met a common defeat, their lines were broken with regard to the Southern recourse. Some of the Breckinridge men opposed secession unless and until the Lincoln government should commit an "overt act" of injury, but many supporters of Bell and Douglas turned to the policy of prompt strokes.<sup>12</sup> The New Orleans *Crescent* and *Bee* are again clear exponents. On November 8 the *Crescent* said: "We read the result in the face of every citizen upon the street. There is an universal feeling that an insult has been deliberately tendered our people, which is responded to not by noisy threats or passionate objurgations, but a settled determination that the South shall never be oppressed under Mr. Lincoln's administration." But it cherished a shadowy hope that electors chosen on the Republican ticket might yet refrain from putting "a sectional President in the chair of Washington!". On December 17 the *Bee* admitted that it had yielded to the prodigious tide of public sentiment, and said in explanation: "It was evident indeed, that amid all the lip service professed for the Union there had dwelt in the hearts of Southerners a tacit determination to regard the election of Lincoln as proof of a settled and immutable policy of aggression by the North toward the South, and to refuse further political affiliation with those who by that act should declare themselves our enemies." On the following January 3 the *Crescent* said:

It is by secession alone that we [Louisiana] can be placed in close affinity with all of our sisters of the Gulf and South Atlantic seaboard, who have given guarantees . . . that they will be out of the Union long in advance of our action and ready to receive us in the Government that shall have been established.<sup>13</sup> South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana and Texas are knit by God and their own hearts indissolubly together. . . .

Believe not that any State has the right to expect another to await her action in an emergency like this. *We have as much right to com-*

<sup>12</sup> Unionism among many of the Bell supporters had been conditioned from the first, almost explicitly, upon constitutionalism as interpreted in favor of Southern rights. For example the convention in Georgia which responded to the call for organizing the party and sent delegates to Baltimore adopted a platform asserting that slavery was established in the Constitution, that the territories were the property of the states jointly, that Congress and the territorial legislatures were alike incapable of impairing the right of slave property, and that it was the duty of Congress to protect the rights of slaveholders in the territories. *Southern Recorder* (Milledgeville, Ga.), May 8, 1860.

<sup>13</sup> These pledges had been conveyed by commissioners appointed by the governors of sundry commonwealths to convey to the governors, legislatures, and conventions of other states assurances of secession as soon as the procedure could be completed and invitations for union in a new nation or confederacy. A study of these commissioners as agents of coordination has been made by Mr. Dwight L. Dumond of the University of Michigan, but has not yet been published.

*plain of the tardiness of the border States as they have of our haste. . . . A people who wait for others to aid them in vindicating their rights are already enslaved, for now, as in every other period of history—*

"In native swords and native ranks  
The only hope of freedom dwells."

The upper South had votaries of independence no less outspoken than those of the cotton belt, but they were too few to carry their states prior to a Northern "overt act". Arguments and eloquence by visiting commissioners might sway the minds and thrill the hearts of delegates, but none of these conventions took a decisive step until Lincoln's call for troops. Indeed there was a project of organizing the border states for a course of their own, even to the extreme of a central confederacy separate alike from the "Black Republican" North and the "hotspur" South. When this was pinched out, the sequel showed that the boundary of predominant Southern loyalty was not Mason and Dixon's line but a curving zone seldom touching that landmark.

Many Virginians, perhaps most of them, sanctioned the change of allegiance reluctantly; and some, chiefly in the Wheeling panhandle, revolted sharply against it. On the other hand the course of the Federal government during the war and after its close alienated so many borderers that in a sense Kentucky joined the Confederacy after the war was over.

While the war dragged its disheartening length and the hopes of independence faded, queries were raised in some Southern quarters as to whether yielding might not be the wiser course. Lincoln in his plan of reconstruction had shown unexpected magnanimity; the Republican party, discarding that obnoxious name, had officially styled itself merely Unionist; and the Northern Democrats, although outvoted, were still a friendly force to be reckoned upon. Die-hard statesmen and loyal soldiers carried on till the collapse. The governors in the "late so-called Confederate States" were now ready with soft speeches, but the Federal soldiery clapped them into prison until Andrew Johnson relaxed from his brief punitive phase.

With Johnson then on Lincoln's path "back to normalcy", Southern hearts were lightened only to sink again when radicals in Congress, calling themselves Republicans once more, overslaughed the Presidential programme and set events in train which seemed to make "the Africanization of the South" inescapable. To most of the whites, doubtless, the prospect showed no gleam of hope.

But Edward A. Pollard, a Virginian critic of Davis, chronicler of the war and bewailer of the "lost cause", took courage in 1868 to write his most significant book, *The Lost Cause Regained*. The

folly of politicians, he said, had made the South defend slavery seemingly "as a property tenure, or as a peculiar institution of labour; when the true ground of defence was as of a barrier against a contention and war of races".<sup>14</sup> The pro-slavery claims on the basis of constitutional right he denounced in retrospect as flimsily technical and utterly futile in the face of a steadily encroaching moral sentiment; and the stroke for independence in the name of liberty he thought as fallacious as the later expectation of generosity which had brought the Confederate collapse.<sup>15</sup>

It has been curiously reserved for the South to obtain *after* the war the actual experience of oppression, and of that measure of despotism which would have amply justified the commencement of hostilities. If it fought, in 1860, for principles too abstract, it has superabundant causes for rebellion now, which although they may not, and need not produce another war, yet have the effect to justify, in a remarkable way, the first appeal to arms.<sup>16</sup>

In elaboration of this: "The black thread of the Negro has been spun throughout the scheme of Reconstruction. A design is betrayed to give to him the political control of the South, not so much as a benefit to him, . . . as to secure power to the Republican party."<sup>17</sup>

But in the defeats of proposals for negro suffrage in seven states from Connecticut to Colorado, and particularly in the ovation with which the Philadelphia convention of 1866 had received a resolution urging the Southern whites not to submit to negro rule, he saw promise of effective support and eventual success in undoing Reconstruction.<sup>18</sup> Therefore:

Let us come back to the true hope of the South. It is to enter bravely with new allies and new auspices the contest for the supremacy of the white man, and with it the preservation of the dearest political traditions of the country. "WHITE" is the winning word, says a North Carolina paper, and let us never be done repeating it. . . . It is the irresistible sympathy of races, which will not, cannot fail. . . . It is this instinct which the South will at last summon to her aid, when her extremity demands it.<sup>19</sup>

Before the farther bank of the slough of despond was fully attained, the question was raised as to the path beyond. In a remarkable address in 1875 Wiley P. Harris of Mississippi lamented the political exploitation of the negroes: "The mass of them don't vote, but are literally voted. They are ridden and driven by a little

<sup>14</sup> E. A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause Regained* (New York, 1868), p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 50, 116.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 129.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 133, 162.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 165.

nest of men who are alien to the state in feeling. . . . The result is a government at once imperious and contemptible, a tyranny at once loathesome and deadly." He bade the carpet-baggers farewell in advance of their going: "I assure these men that their last card has been played, and it has not won. This trumpery no longer deceives anybody, and it matters not which party prevails in 1876, no national administration will again incur the odium of propping them up." But with merely restoring white local domination he would not be content. Appealing specifically for a renewed and permanent union of Democrats with liberal Republicans throughout the country, he said:

To reconcile and nationalize the South, to lead it out of the cul de sac of sectionalism into the broad stream of national life, . . . to restore peace, good will and confidence between the members of this great family of States, will lay the solid and durable foundation of a party which will surely win and long retain the hearts of the American people. . . . For one, I long to see a government at Washington, and a government here, toward which I can feel a genuine sentiment of reverence and respect. It is a dreary life we lead here, with a national government ever suspicious and ever frowning, and a home government feeble, furtive, false and fraudulent. Under such influences the feeling of patriotism must die out amongst us, and this will accomplish the ruin of a noble population. . . . We are in a new world. We are moving on a new plane. It is better that we hang a millstone about our necks than cling to these old issues. To cling to them is to perpetuate sectional seclusion.<sup>20</sup>

Lamar's eulogy of Sumner and the speeches and editorials of Grady were much to the same effect, and likewise were the efforts of other broad-minded men. But a certain sense of bafflement and of defensive self-containment persists to our own day, because the negro population remains as at least a symbolic potentiality. Virtually all respectable whites had entered the Democratic ranks in the later 'sixties to combat *à outrance* the Republican programme of negro incitement. A dozen years sufficed to restore white control, whereupon they began to differ among themselves upon various issues. Many joined the People's party; and in some quarters a fusion was arranged of Populists and Republicans to carry elections. In the stress of campaigning this threatened to bring from within the South a stimulus to negroes as political auxiliaries.

But by Southern hypothesis, exalted into a creed, negroes in the mass were incompetent for any good political purpose and by reason of their inexperience and racial unwisdom were likely to prove subversive. To remove the temptation to white politicians to lead negroes to the polls again, "white primaries" were instituted

<sup>20</sup> Speech of W. P. Harris at a Democratic campaign meeting, Jackson, Miss., Aug. 23, 1875. Lowry and McCordle, *History of Mississippi*, pp. 396-400.

to control nominations, educational requirements for the suffrage were inserted in the state constitutions, and the Bryanizing of the Democratic party was accepted as a means of healing a white rift. Even these devices did not wholly lay the spectre of "negro domination"; for the fifteenth amendment stood in the Constitution and the calendar of Congress was not yet free of "force bills". For every Lodge and Foraker there arose a Tillman and a Vardaman, with a Watson and a Bleas to spare.

The sentiments and symbols have not been wholly divorced from reason. When California whites made extravagant demands in fear that her three per cent. of Japanese might increase to four and capture the business of "The Coast", Congress responded as if it were an appendage of the state legislature. But white Southerners when facing problems real or fancied concerning the ten million negroes in their midst can look to the federal authorities for no more at best than a tacit acquiescence in what their state governments may do. Acquiescence does not evoke enthusiasm; and until an issue shall arise predominant over the lingering one of race, political solidarity at the price of provincial status is maintained to keep assurance doubly, trebly sure that the South shall remain "a white man's country".

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### CHARLES II.'S PART IN GOVERNING ENGLAND

IT has often been thought that Charles II. gave himself largely to gaiety, amours, sport, and interest in science, except during some emergencies, when he showed high ability in statecraft. Contemporary descriptions to that effect have been elaborated again and again in subsequent writings. Probably insufficient justice has been done.

Clarendon says Charles "grew more disposed to leave all things to their natural course, and God's providence . . . by degrees unbent his mind from the knotty and ungrateful part of his business . . . and indulged to his youth and appetite that license and satisfaction that it desired".<sup>1</sup> In the original draft of his history, commenced in 1683, Burnet wrote: "He never enters upon business with any himself, but if his ministers can once draw him into business, they may hold him at it as long as they will. He loves his ease so much, that the great secret of all his ministers is to find out his temper exactly and to be easy to him."<sup>2</sup> A later version by Burnet was the one published in 1723: Charles "was during the active part of life given up to sloth and lewdness to such a degree, that he hated business, and could not bear the engaging in any thing that gave him much trouble, or put him under any constraint".<sup>3</sup> Clarendon was well meaning but not sympathetic in his comment, while here Burnet had necessarily to rely for the most part on gossip and portrayal by others.

From such opinions most later descriptions were made. William Harris, best of the older biographers, averred: "Charles, though blessed with a genius capable of great things, applied himself but little to the affairs of government."<sup>4</sup> According to Hume, writing a few years before, Charles was "profuse, thoughtless, and negligent"; all his faults might be "imputed, in a great measure, to the

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon . . . in Which Is Included a Continuation, etc.* (Oxford, 1827), I. 358.

<sup>2</sup> H. C. Foxcroft, *A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time* (Oxford, 1902), pp. 49-50.

<sup>3</sup> *History of His Own Time* (Oxford, 1823), II. 467.

<sup>4</sup> *An Historical and Critical Account of the Life of Charles the Second, etc.* (London, 1766), II. 1.

indolence of his temper".<sup>5</sup> Two generations later the judicious Lingard believed that "with talents, said to be of the highest order, he joined an insuperable antipathy to application".<sup>6</sup> Later still Lord Macaulay said: "He detested business, and would sooner have abdicated his crown than have undergone the trouble of really directing the administration. Such was his aversion to toil, and such his ignorance of affairs, that the very clerks who attended him when he sat in council could not refrain from sneering at his frivolous remarks, and at his childish impatience."<sup>7</sup>

Modern authorities for the most part give much the same impression. According to the brilliant narrative of Trevelyan, Charles was "lazy and spendthrift". He could be found anywhere but in the council chamber. "If at last he was caught and brought into council, he played with his dogs and let the others talk unheeded."<sup>8</sup>

Study of the contemporary governmental records—the Privy Council Register and the various supplementary state papers in the Public Record Office and in the British Museum—makes it evident that Charles II. attended assiduously the meetings of the Privy Council, much more than his father and very much more than his grandfather had done. "Very constant he is at the council table on council-days", said Pepys in 1665, "which his predecessors, it seems, very rarely did."<sup>9</sup> James I. had, indeed, gone seldom to the Privy Council, and for the most part Charles I. had stayed away. Charles II. went pretty regularly from the beginning of his reign.<sup>10</sup> In 1668 the register records him present almost every third day through the year, at one hundred and three out of one hundred and fifteen meetings.<sup>11</sup> During 1673 he was frequently present.<sup>12</sup> In 1678 he came to eighty-one out of eighty-nine sessions.<sup>13</sup> Apparently also he was sometimes at meetings when his presence is not shown by the record. Contemporary accounts make it clear that councillors were reluctant to bring up important matters when he was not present, and postponed business when he could not attend. That Charles was often

<sup>5</sup> *The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Revolution in 1688* (London, 1830), VI. 237.

<sup>6</sup> *The History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688* (London, 1849), X. 111.

<sup>7</sup> *History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, ch. II.

<sup>8</sup> G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (London, 1904), pp. 354-355.

<sup>9</sup> *Diary*, Feb. 27, 1664/5.

<sup>10</sup> Privy Council Register, vols. LIV., LV., LVI.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, vols. LX., LXI.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, vols. LXIII., LXIV.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. LXVI.

wearied with the drudgery and routine of the board is evident from the notes which he exchanged with Clarendon at council.<sup>14</sup>

During all this time much administrative work was carried on in various committees of the council, which met in between the meetings of the council itself. Not infrequently Charles came to standing and sometimes to temporary committees.<sup>15</sup> At sessions—one or more a week—of the all-important committee that was getting to possess the essence of the power of the Privy Council he was often present, as a generation before his father had been. In the time of Charles I. there had been a potent committee of foreign affairs. After the Restoration came a succession of such committees, which contemporaries referred to as "cabinet", "junto", "cabal", or simply as "the committee". From 1660 to 1668 there was the somewhat mysterious "foreign committee", of which accounts remain in Clarendon's *Life and Continuation* and in the notes of Secretary Nicholas scattered in the State Papers, Domestic; at meetings of this group Charles was usually present.<sup>16</sup> During the next eleven years there was a formally appointed council committee of foreign affairs. Charles was very often at these meetings, where the important and more secret matters, domestic as well as foreign, were considered and decided before being brought to the council—if they were brought there.<sup>17</sup> After the reform of the Privy Council in 1679 the foreign committee was succeeded by the committee of intelligence; Charles appears to have been present generally at meetings of this body, which assembled once a week or more often.<sup>18</sup> As the committee of foreign affairs or "the committee" appeared again, he was very often at the meetings.<sup>19</sup>

To all this should be added some account of the work which then, as at other times, the king constantly did with his secretaries of state, in conference with particular ministers, or with small groups of min-

<sup>14</sup> Bodleian Library, Clarendon MSS. 100, 101; printed in *Notes Which Passed at Meetings of the Privy Council between Charles II. and the Earl of Clarendon, 1660–1667*, etc. (Roxburghe Club Publications, London, 1896).

<sup>15</sup> For example, British Museum, Additional MS. 18730, Feb. 9, 1679/80, Apr. 14, 1680.

<sup>16</sup> For example, *Notes Passed at Privy Council*, pp. 5, 49, 50, 72; Clarendon, *Life and Continuation*, II. 11, 12–15, 16, 216, 217, 224.

<sup>17</sup> State Papers, Foreign, Entry Books, Miscellaneous, CLXXVI.–CLXXX.; State Papers, Miscellaneous, CCXV., Apr. 1, 21, 1678; State Papers, Domestic, Charles II., CCCCVIII., Nov. 30, 1678.

<sup>18</sup> Add. MS. 15643, *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> For example, Historical MSS. Commission, *Seventh Report*, app., pp. 357, 359, 369; State Papers, Domestic, Entry Books, LXIII. 36; State Papers, Foreign, Entry Books, CLXXXIX., July 31, 1682; CXC., Apr. 30, 1683; CXCI., Nov. 26, 1683.

isters especially trusted, in audiences or meetings with representatives from abroad, in respect of petitions, in connection with Parliament, in foreign correspondence, and in other miscellaneous work.

Probably Charles II. was more engaged in government routine than Charles I. had been, and more than Anne or George I. or George II. were after his time. "He grew by Age", said Halifax, who knew him much better than Burnet, "into a pretty exact *Distribution* of his Hours, both for his Business, Pleasures, and the Exercise for his Health."<sup>20</sup> That he was able regularly to perform so many tasks, and also to throw himself into so much diversion, debauchery, social activity, and patronage of science and learning—which struck the imagination of many about him—is because he was a man, like his grandfather, Henry IV., of unusual virility and physique.

RAYMOND TURNER.

#### THE CREATIONS OF PEERS RECOMMENDED BY THE YOUNGER PITT

THERE is perhaps no more widely current conception of the political activities of the younger Pitt than that he consolidated his position with that of his party by the elevation to the House of Lords of men from the commercial and manufacturing classes, whose numbers and wealth had so greatly increased during the eighteenth century. Nowhere is that idea more clearly expressed, and no authority has given it wider circulation than Green's *Short History of the English People*, published in 1874. His pages offer an explanation of the process by which the House of Lords, which had been the stronghold of the Whig oligarchy, became Tory after the large number of peer creations by Pitt. This was accomplished, he says, by Pitt "pouring into it members of the middle and commercial class . . . small landowners, bankers, merchants, nabobs, army contractors, lawyers, soldiers and seamen [who thus] revolutionized the Upper House".<sup>1</sup>

This idea, so far as we may judge, was probably derived from two sources. The first was George Wingrove Cooke's *History of Party*. Since Cooke's book was published in 1837 it is possible that the annoyance of a good Whig at the conduct of the House of Lords in the earlier years of that decade affected his conclusions. He says that Pitt in his search for means of establishing control in the Upper House "wisely divined that the surest way to accomplish that object was to fill the house with men whose descent was not such as to

<sup>20</sup> "A Character of King Charles II.", in *The Complete Works of George Savile, First Marquess of Halifax*, ed. by Walter Raleigh (Oxford, 1912), p. 202.

<sup>1</sup> Green, *Short History of the English People*, pp. 792-793.

enable them to take liberties with their dignity; who would vote popular doctrines vulgar, and think that their nobility compelled them to be exclusive".<sup>2</sup> The other source Green himself mentions when he says that Pitt defined his aim to be to bring "the peerage into close relations with the landowning and opulent classes". Cobbett's report of a speech of Pitt's in January 1789 says: "He mentioned the fluctuation of wealth and property in the country, and the propriety of raising monied men to the peerage in order to give the landed interest its fair balance and share of honors."<sup>3</sup> Where Pitt may well have meant the *landowning opulent classes*, Green interprets him to have meant the *landowning and other opulent classes*. If a misinterpretation of Pitt's speech gave Green his idea as to what sort of people Pitt raised to the peerage, Cooke may have suggested to him that the former status of those people was the key to the political effect of their membership in the House of Lords. Green must have suspected later that there was something wrong with this, for he leaves out the whole discussion of Pitt's relations with the peerage in the enlarged edition of his work which came out during the years 1877-1880. In 1883 Green died, and most of the subsequent editions of his work contain those paragraphs from the *Short History* of 1874, sometimes in complete form, sometimes with a sentence or so omitted.

The impression created by Green's specific language is that Pitt changed the social and economic basis of the peerage by a deluge of new peers representative of the rising commercial classes and the professions, and quite unconnected with the old aristocracy, and that impression was copied in many if not most succeeding histories. By Rosebery in his life of Pitt in the English Statesmen series, by Hunt and by Robertson in their specialized volumes on this period, by Pollard in his *Evolution of Parliament*, and such books it has been made a part of the accepted historical chronicle.<sup>4</sup> This idea was not confined to historians; it seems to have been a common opinion in the nineteenth century; it even found its way into fiction. In speaking of Pitt in *Sybil Disraeli* says: "He created a plebeian aristocracy and mingled it with the patrician oligarchy. He made peers of sec-

<sup>2</sup> Cooke, *History of Party*, III. 364.

<sup>3</sup> *Parliamentary History*, XXVII. 943. May cites this speech, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, I. 227. This may have called Green's attention to it. May (writing before Green) stresses Pitt's large additions to the peerage, but does not discuss the social or economic background of the new peers.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History*, pp. 713-715; Rosebery, *Pitt*, p. 276; Hunt, *Political History of England*, 1760-1801, pp. 281-282; Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians*, pp. 352-353; Tout, *An Advanced History of Great Britain*, p. 590; Pollard, *Evolution of Parliament*, p. 590.

ond rate squires and fat graziers. He caught them in the alleys of Lombard Street, and clutched in the counting-houses of Cornhill. When Mr. Pitt, in an age of bank restriction declared that every man with an estate of ten thousand a year had the right to be a peer he sounded the knell of the cause for which Hampden died on the field, and Sydney on the scaffold.”<sup>5</sup>

There exist, however, remarks by Pitt's contemporaries hard to reconcile with this. According to Wraxall the only case during the whole reign of George III. in which a person engaged in trade was elevated to the peerage was that of Robert Smith created Baron Carrington in 1796.<sup>6</sup> That the peerage at that time sank so low as to include those whose hands were soiled by trade was not suggested in any of the letters published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in which the correspondents express their annoyance at the augmentation of that body.<sup>7</sup> If such were the case the omission is surprising. How then are we to explain the discrepancy between contemporaries and historians? Light may be thrown on the actual occurrence by turning to the lists of peers.

During Pitt's first administration he created or promoted 130 English peers.<sup>8</sup> In doing this he did not double, as has been so often said, the size of the House of Lords, for there were 195 English peers (exclusive of peeresses and bishops) when Pitt came into office. Because many of the titles he granted were promotions of persons already English peers, and because some titles became extinct during that time, there were but 273 members of the English peerage at the close of his first administration in 1801, which is an increase of 40 per cent. The House of Lords had been further enlarged by the addition of 28 Irish peers and 4 Irish bishops. Counting in English peers, English bishops, Scottish representative peers, and the Irish representation, the Upper House grew from 237 to 347, a gain of a little more than 46 per cent.<sup>9</sup> This figure would be increased a trifle by the six additions in Pitt's second administration.<sup>10</sup> It is more nearly correct to say that Pitt enlarged the House by one-half rather than that he doubled its numbers.

<sup>5</sup> Disraeli, *Sybil* (ed. 1845), pp. 19–20.

<sup>6</sup> Wraxall, *Memoirs*, ed. Wheatley, III, 393.

<sup>7</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. LXVIII., pt. II., p. 1035 (Dec. 1798); vol. LXIX., pt. I., p. 36 (Jan. 1799); vol. LXXXIV., pt. II., p. 32 (Jan. 1814).

<sup>8</sup> Beatson, *Political Index*, I. 140–150.

<sup>9</sup> These figures are compiled from the *Royal Kalendar* for the years 1783 and 1801, checked from other sources.

<sup>10</sup> These creations were: three rewards for naval victories; a barony to Addington; the promotion of Lord Clive to an earldom; and a barony to Sir Charles Middleton, a cousin of Lord Melville. The peerages of the first administration only will be considered in detail hereafter.

An inquiry concerning the sort of people to whom Pitt granted peerages shows at first glance that thirty-seven of them were persons already English peers, who received higher or additional titles, or changes in title, and four of them were members of the royal family.<sup>11</sup> This reduces the number of persons to be suspected of unaristocratic antecedents to less than ninety. In the case of forty more, their very close connections with the old noble families can be demonstrated at once. Eighteen of these forty were either sons or brothers of English peers; or else they were near relatives to whom the estates of peers passed without the title, and whose elevations to the peerage were in the nature of a confirmation of titles which they claimed.<sup>12</sup> The others who must be included in this list who may be shown at once to be members of the old noble class, were near relatives or close connections of the great families, as for example Thomas Pitt, own cousin of William Pitt the younger, and Viscount Middleton of the Irish peerage who was a son-in-law of Thomas Pelham and nephew of Viscount Townshend.<sup>13</sup> So far our investigation has revealed a background in striking contrast to the one pictured by Green, for practically 62 per cent. of Pitt's peers.

Of the remaining forty-nine, seventeen were powerful landlords already Scottish or Irish peers at the time when Pitt raised them to the English peerage. This number includes seven Scottish peers,<sup>14</sup> three of them dukes: the Duke of Atholl whose family had been for a long time sovereigns of the Isle of Man;<sup>15</sup> the Duke of Gordon whose charming duchess made her London house a rallying-point for Pitt's supporters; and the Duke of Queensberry, who like the other two dukes returned three members for Scottish boroughs to the

<sup>11</sup> The information for the classification which follows has been gleaned from the list in Beatson; the *Dictionary of National Biography*; Cokayne, *Complete Peerage*; Collins, *Peerage of England*; Burke, *Peerage*; Burke, *Extinct and Dormant Peerage*.

<sup>12</sup> George Townshend, H. F. Carteret, Sir John Griffin Griffin, Joseph Yorke, W. W. Grenville, Henrietta Pulteney, P. A. Curzon, Baron Westcot, Baron Mulgrave, R. G. W. Trefusis, Charles Medows Pierrepont, Edward Lascelles, John Rolle, Thomas Orde-Powlett, Charles Townshend, James Grenville, George Granville Leveson-Gower, Robert Hobart.

<sup>13</sup> Charles Cocks, James Lowther, Thomas Pitt, Edward Eliot, Noel Hill, John Parker, George Carleton, Earl of Tyrone, Earl of Shannon, Duke of Montagu, Earl of Abercorn, Viscount Gage, Earl of Upper Ossory, C. A. Pelham, Sir Thomas Dundas, Sir Henry Bridgeman, Earl Macartney, John Campbell, Sir Peter Burrell, Viscount Middleton, Earl of Carysfort, Marquis of Drogheda.

<sup>14</sup> Dukes of Atholl, Queensberry, and Gordon; Earls of Galloway, Moray, and Morton; Lord Perth.

<sup>15</sup> They were until 1765, see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

House of Commons.<sup>16</sup> We find ten Irish peers of ancient estates,<sup>17</sup> of whom three were noblemen whose support was necessary for putting through the Union. These creations represented the really important members of the Scottish and Irish peerage, and their social status may be gathered from some examples of their family connections. Among the brothers-in-law of the Earl of Galloway were the Marquis of Stafford, the Earl of Aboyne, the Duke of Hamilton, and the Earl of Dunmore.<sup>18</sup> Lord Seaforth was closely connected with the Stanhope family by marriage,<sup>19</sup> and while these peers may not be classified with the list of those who really were members of the old oligarchy, they belong to a group not very far distant from them either in the social scale or in their economic position.

We have dealt with all but thirty-two of the one hundred and thirty peer creations of Pitt without wandering very far from the fold of the old aristocracy. These thirty-two peers fall into two sections: fifteen easily identified as landed gentry; and seventeen of a miscellaneous class. Among the gentry was Archibald Douglas, one of the twin sons of Lady Jane Douglas, whom the opposing heirs claimed to be spurious. The other gentry were English.<sup>20</sup> Six of them were county members of the House of Commons, and nine of them had already the title of baronet. As we found to be the case with the more important members of the Scottish and Irish peerages, many of them were connected with the nobility of the early century: for example the mother of Sir John Rushout was a daughter of the Earl of Northampton; and the mother of Edwin Lascelles was a sister of the Duke of Somerset. Of the seventeen scattering peerages, eight were conferred as rewards for military or naval service;<sup>21</sup> three were law creations;<sup>22</sup> one was a diplomatic creation;<sup>23</sup> four were political henchmen of unaristocratic origin, but neither com-

<sup>16</sup> Oldfield, *History of Boroughs* (1794), vol. II., appendix.

<sup>17</sup> Marquis of Ely; Earls of Ormond and Ossory, Clare, Fife, Donegal, Courtenay; Viscounts Bulkeley, Grimston, Darnay; Lord Seaforth.

<sup>18</sup> Granville Leveson-Gower, *Private Correspondence, 1781-1821* (ed. Castalia Countess Granville). See genealogical tables in appendix.

<sup>19</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

<sup>20</sup> Sir Thomas Egerton, James Dutton, Sir Harbord Harbord, Edwin Lascelles, Sir James Peachy, Sir John Rous, Sir Henry Calthorpe, Sir Francis Bassett, Thomas Powis, Sir John Wodehouse, Sir Gilbert Elliot, Thomas Lister, Sir John Rushout. In this class, also, comes Edward Lord Clive, son of Robert who had succeeded to his father's Irish barony in 1774, and got his English barony in 1794. He married the daughter of the Earl of Powis, and later was granted his father-in-law's title.

<sup>21</sup> Sir G. A. Elliot, Adam Duncan, Sir John Jervis, Sir Horatio Nelson, Earl of Mornington, Samuel Hood, Alexander Hood, Catherine Hood (wife of Samuel).

<sup>22</sup> Sir Lloyd Kenyon, John Scott, Lord Mulgrave.

<sup>23</sup> Sir James Harris.

mercial nor manufacturing.<sup>24</sup> Among all these men we find only one of the latter, a banker, a member of the firm of Smith, Payne, and Company of London, Robert Smith, created Lord Carrington. None remains to be accounted for, and, even as Wraxall said, there seems to be no other who was actually engaged in trade.

It is true that there were among Pitt's recommendations at least one representative each of the "small landowners, bankers, merchants, nabobs, army contractors, lawyers, soldiers and seamen", if you count Robert Smith as both a banker and a merchant. The nabobs are represented by descendants of nabobs who had bought estates, married into the gentry or nobility and become baronets or perhaps Irish peers long since, as for example the son of Clive, or Sir Henry Calthorpe created Baron Calthorpe in 1796.<sup>25</sup> This of course had been a normal way for new men to be recruited for the aristocracy, but we can find no closer approach to an army contractor than Sir Thomas Dundas, whose father was one from 1748 to 1758.<sup>26</sup>

It was not by buying their support with titles that Pitt kept the commercial classes loyal to his party but by making sure that they were consulted on measures which touched them economically.<sup>27</sup> This he took pains to do, although for the most part they were quite outside the functioning of the ordinary political organs. In the ranks of those whom he raised to the peerage, however, are found persons whose good-will was of direct importance in controlling the governmental machinery. The support of the old nobles whom he raised a notch in the peerage and for whose younger sons he provided, and the support of the great landlords whom he placed for the first time in the ranks of the nobility, gained him not only additional votes in the House of Lords, but also the votes of members of the House of Commons whose seats these people controlled.<sup>28</sup>

It is claimed that Pitt's lavish use of the peerage was forced upon him by the decrease in the number of sinecure offices and other means of patronage brought about by the economical reform of Rockingham's second administration.<sup>29</sup> It must not be forgotten, however,

<sup>24</sup> Charles Jenkinson, Welbore Ellis, W. Eden, Lord Delaval of Ireland.

<sup>25</sup> His paternal grandfather, Sir Henry Gough, who died in 1727 made a fortune in India and China trade and established himself on estates in Warwickshire. The Sir Henry created Baron Calthorpe in 1796 had assumed his mother's name. See Collins, *Peerage of England*, VIII, 481-501.

<sup>26</sup> See Cokayne, *Complete Peerage* (1910), IV, 522. Sir Thomas married Lady Charlotte Fitzwilliam, a niece of Rockingham. He received his peerage when his brother-in-law, the second Earl Fitzwilliam, came over to the government in 1794.

<sup>27</sup> On this point see a most illuminating account in Witt Bowden, *Industrial Society in England Toward the End of the Eighteenth Century*, especially ch. III.

<sup>28</sup> See Oldfield, *History of Boroughs* (1794), vol. II., appendix.

<sup>29</sup> Hunt, *Political History of England*, 1760-1801, pp. 281-282; Rosebery, *Pitt*, p. 276.

that after 1782 there were still large sources of patronage open to manipulation by the ministry. Furthermore, the use of the peerage as a reward for political service was not new; it had been normal since the Restoration. Pitt did not introduce this weapon, he simply brought it into play more often.

Since Pitt succeeded in transforming the House of Lords from a Whig into a Tory stronghold the earlier political allegiance of the new and the promoted peers is of significance. During the first ten years of his administration the bulk of his promotions of old peers occurred, and the new peers were largely those closely connected with the aristocracy. In this early group those who were old Whigs outnumber those who were old Tories two to one.<sup>30</sup> After the political changes of 1793 when nearly everyone came over to Pitt there was a change in the type of new peers. Rewards were in order for the recruits, and these included many country gentry, long loyal to North, who had stayed in opposition against Pitt until that time. It follows that in this period the majority of old Whigs is not so large, and there are more who were not in political life before 1784, or whose earlier politics are for other reasons obscure.

The immediate political effect of Pitt's use of peerage creations has led to erroneous conclusions about its effect in the long run. The die-hard Toryism of the House of Lords in the early eighteen-thirties has been laid to Pitt.<sup>31</sup> An analysis of the division lists shows that this is hardly justified. The vote on the second reading of the second reform bill on October 7, 1831, was 199–158 against the bill.<sup>32</sup> The vote was as follows:

	Against the bill	For the bill
English Peers		
Creations before George III. ....	51	60
" 1760–1783 .....	19	14
" of Pitt .....	27	23
" since Pitt .....	53	51
	—	—
Total .....	150	148
Royal Dukes .....	2	1

<sup>30</sup> The information about the politics of these peers is from the division lists in Cobbett, both of the Lords and Commons. The new edition of Cokayne, *Complete Peerage*, of which volumes I–VI. (A–H) have come out, 1910–1926, attempts to give the politics of the peers. In the case of the peers considered here most of the evidence seems to have been taken from Cobbett.

<sup>31</sup> Rosebery, *Pitt*, p. 270; Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians*, p. 353.

<sup>32</sup> See list in Hansard, third ser., III, 339. In the analysis which follows the date of the original admission to the English peerage of the incumbent or his ancestor has been considered, not the date when the title held at that time was conferred.

Bishops .....	21	*	2
Rep. Irish peers .....	15		4
Rep. Scottish peers .....	11		3
—	—	—	—
Total .....	199		158

When the Lords passed the third bill on its second reading on April 13, 1832, the vote was 184-175.<sup>33</sup> It was as follows:

	Against the bill	For the bill
English Peers		
Creations before George III. ....	47	64
" 1760-1783 ....	18	15
" of Pitt ....	22	28
" since Pitt ....	47	57
—	—	—
Total .....	134	164
Royal Dukes .....	2	1
Bishops .....	15	12
Rep. Irish peers .....	13	4
Rep. Scottish peers .....	11	3
—	—	—
Total .....	175	184

The vote of Pitt's peers shows a lower per cent. against the bill on the October division than does the total vote. On the April division the actual numerical majority of the Pitt peers who voted for the second reading is almost as large as the total majority for it, and it would scarcely appear from this that it was the recalcitrancy of a disproportionate number of Pitt's peers which caused Toryism in the House of Lords to become so grave an issue in the early eighteen-thirties.

Finally it was perhaps true that Pitt used grants of peerages as a political weapon more frequently than had been the custom. But in doing this he did not alter the social or economic basis of the peerage, though his enlargement of its ranks meant the inclusion of a greater number of the more powerful landlords. He did not admit to it in numbers of any significance representatives of the new wealth. That this political weapon was effective when wielded in favor of a large number of the old ruling class is suggestive as to the basis and personnel of Pitt's support.

GERDA C. RICHARDS.

<sup>33</sup> Hansard, third ser., XII. 454-459.

## DOCUMENTS

### 1. *Diary of José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, 1811-1812, I.*

(Translated from the original Spanish)<sup>1</sup>

THE *Diario* of Gutiérrez de Lara, the extant fragments of which are herewith presented in English translation, is one of a small collection of manuscripts purchased by the Texas State Library in 1919 from Dr. Lorenzo de la Garza, of Ciudad Guerrero, Tamaulipas, Mexico. The present editor had learned of the whereabouts of these manuscripts in 1915, through Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara, a great-grandson of the diarist, as the result of an inquiry suggested by a statement of Dr. Herbert E. Bolton in his *Guide to Materials for American History in the Archives of Mexico* to the effect that papers of Gutiérrez de Lara were supposed to be privately owned in Guerrero.

José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara was one of the most active and devoted of the Mexican Republicans who in the ten years' War of Independence freed Mexico from Spain. His biography, together with that of his older brother, Father José Antonio Gutiérrez de Lara, is contained in a slender volume entitled *Dos Hermanos Héroes*, written by the Dr. Garza mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, and published by the state of Tamaulipas in 1913. As its title implies, it is a eulogistic biography; it is based largely upon the papers of Gutiérrez de Lara and other historical manuscripts and public documents, many of which are quoted entire or in part. The facts which it brings out supplement and correct the brief sketch in Appleton's *Cyclopedia of American Biography*; its interpretation of these facts must be tested in the light of other evidence to which Dr. Garza has apparently not had access.

Gutiérrez de Lara, according to this biography, was born in Revilla, now Ciudad Guerrero, on August 20, 1774, and died in Santiago, Mexico, on May 13, 1841. His parents, Santiago Gutiér-

<sup>1</sup> To the difficulties always encountered in translating a piece of non-literary foreign writing, characterized by provincialisms that do not find their way into standard dictionaries, has been added in this case long distance from well-established libraries and reference material. I have therefore had to depend upon several friends for help in difficult passages, both in translation and in note-writing. Chief among those not mentioned specifically in the notes is Dr. James A. Robertson of Washington, secretary of the Florida State Historical Society.

rez de Lara and María Rosa de Uribe, the biographer says, were persons of good business and social standing. He received a fair education, went into trade,<sup>2</sup> married at the age of twenty-four, and amassed a competence. At the outbreak of the Mexican War of Independence in 1810 he was a substantial citizen, a man of family, a few weeks past his thirty-sixth birthday. Within a few months thereafter he definitely placed himself on the side of the insurgents.

An English translation of a report presented by him under date August 1, 1815, to "the Sovereign National Congress of Mexico",<sup>3</sup> has been published by the Texas State Library.<sup>4</sup> This report tells the story of the Revolution in the Eastern Interior Provinces, especially his own activities, from the beginning. According to this account, Jiménez early in 1811 entered Mateguala with a view to the invasion of the Eastern Interior Provinces, against the opposition of the Royalist officers, Cordero, Iturbe, Salcedo, and Herrera. Gutiérrez de Lara coöperated with Jiménez in this campaign, spreading propaganda and thus gaining many recruits.

In April Gutiérrez joined Hidalgo, Allende, and Jiménez at the Hacienda de Santa María, near Saltillo, proffered his services, and unfolded his own plans. He was appointed colonel and sent into Colonia<sup>5</sup> to organize forces and to move to "the Rio Grande Garrison".<sup>6</sup>

Despite the active Royalist opposition, the revolutionary forces prospered for a while in the Eastern Interior Provinces even as far east as Texas, where on January 22, 1811, Captain Juan Bautista

<sup>2</sup> What the trade was, Garza does not state. An anonymous "Memoir by a citizen of the U. S.", Oct. 20, 1825, calls him "a Mexican blacksmith, Bernardo Gutiérrez". Béxar Archives.

<sup>3</sup> The Mexican Revolutionary Congress, first organized at Chilpancingo in September, 1813. Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, IV, 560-568 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> This translation was made by Katherine Elliott, then archivist of the Texas State Library, now secretary to the American commercial attaché in Madrid; it is contained in the first volume of the *Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar* (Austin, 1921). This document will hereafter be referred to as *Lamar Papers*.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., Colonia del Nuevo Santander. Part of this region is now Tamaulipas. For the story of Escandón's colonization see Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, pp. 291-302.

<sup>6</sup> I.e., Presidio del Rio Grande, formerly the Presidio de San Juan Bautista. It was on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, in connection with the missions San Juan Bautista and San Bernardo. Presidio County, Texas, takes its name from this presidio. See the "Map of the Republic of Texas and the Adjacent Territories . . ." in Kennedy, *Texas*, p. 329; also the "Mapa de la Sierra Gorda y Costa del Seno-Mexicano . . ." in Prieto, *Historia de Tamaulipas*; also reference maps in Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, and Hatcher, *Opening of Texas to Foreign Settlement, 1801-1821*. See also Fulmore, *History and Geography of Texas as told in County Names*, p. 22.

Casas declared for Hidalgo, overthrew the Royalist government at San Antonio de Béxar, and made himself governor.

The revolutionary leaders formed a plan to unite the troops of Coahuila, Texas, Nuevo León, and Santander, and march to Béxar. Thither Ignacio Aldama, revolutionary envoy to the United States, was to send the American volunteers and arms that he hoped to acquire in the North. At Béxar a powerful army was then to be equipped "to assure communication with the North and to return against the factious parties at our back". The execution of this plan was prevented by a counter-revolution in Béxar in March, and the arrest of Aldama and his companion, Father Zalazar.

Gutiérrez, realizing the importance of carrying out this plan, offered his own services for the mission to the United States which Aldama's arrest had frustrated. According to his plan a government was to be formed at "the Rio Grande Garrison". This government was to appoint him its plenipotentiary, furnish him letters of credit, as much gold as possible, an escort of fifty men, and a secretary. He was then to go to the United States, where he felt certain of being able to accomplish a great deal for the revolutionary cause. At a secret council of the principal revolutionary officers the project was approved; Gutiérrez was appointed plenipotentiary of the government to be formed, and was promised everything necessary for his mission. Credentials were duly furnished him in the name of the government-to-be.

On April 17, 1811, before setting out on this mission he started down to Colonia to carry out the recruiting project entrusted to him by Hidalgo and Allende. This attempt was unsuccessful. His chiefs were arrested on April 22, and, in the course of the next few months, all put to death; he himself, though able to make a few converts in Monclova, found it expedient in view of surrounding dangers to hide in Revilla, "like the miserable mole among the leaves", as he says.

Here he remained until the end of July, 1811, when Captain Menchaca came to Revilla, fleeing before Salcedo. Gutiérrez hid the fugitive, assembled twelve adherents, whom he equipped "with arms, munitions, money, and pack-animals, . . . took all the treasure . . . in gold and silver" that he could carry, and, on August 1, set out with José Menchaca and the twelve, "travelling toward the north across the least known and least travelled regions".

The party seems to have paused for some time among certain Indian tribes. Gutiérrez attempted to win their friendship, with the result that many of them, he says, promised coöperation with the revolutionists.

About the middle of September the party started eastward on the first stage of their journey toward Natchitoches. They got safely past hostile Indians, but were attacked in the Neutral Ground by fifty enemies, presumably Royalists. Eleven out of the fourteen in Gutiérrez's party, he says, "escaped with arms in hand, losing everything we carried, and most important of all, the papers and dispatches which proved my commission in a positive manner".

After their arrival at Natchitoches, Menchaca and Gutiérrez separated, the former starting for Béxar in the middle of October to take command of volunteer troops understood to be there, the latter continuing toward the United States. Menchaca was to establish a provisional government and to send Gutiérrez the necessary credentials, letter of credit, and funds to buy guns. Gutiérrez took only one travelling companion, "a boy who wished to accompany" him, and "two hundred pesos out of five hundred", the rest having been stolen, to use his own words, "by the good Frenchman, master of the house where we were attacked by the fifty enemies". Before leaving Natchitoches Gutiérrez, on September 27, 1811, wrote to "Tomas Monroi, Secretario del Estado", a letter explaining his position and, in the name of humanity, soliciting from the United States government its protection, and aid in men, money, and arms, especially arms, to the cause he informally, but "with the most formality possible", represented.<sup>7</sup> "An employee of the government of the North" gave letters of introduction to some persons along the way, and a sworn declaration on the oath of companions who knew of his commission and its loss.

In the *Report* to the Mexican Congress previously cited he sums up the journey from Louisiana to Washington in two paragraphs:

The first place I reached was Natchez, capital of the Mississippi territory. There was a Spaniard there who had been consul for the King of Spain in New Orleans, and this grand rascal paid two assassins to kill me on the road. They followed me for six days, during which time I suspected nothing. At the end of the sixth day they attacked me, but as I did not carry my arms to play with, I put a quietus on them and continued without this danger.

I went through various states and always succeeded in communicating with the governors and various generals I found there, treating with first one and then another on matters regarding the funds and arms which we were trying to get. I found them all attentive to our just cause. They made me many offers and aided me to reach their government. The rest of the people, principally in Kentucky and Tennessee . . . did not even want me to proceed, wishing me to remain there, and saying that they would make up a considerable army of volunteers, with which, under my

<sup>7</sup> Letter signed also by "Fr. Mariano Sosa, Cura"; first letter in vol. "Mexico, 1811-1825", Consular Archives, Department of State.

command, we would invade the provinces of Mexico and sweep before us all the oppressors of our liberty. But as I did not consider this wise, I continued until the middle of December, when I arrived at the capital of the country, which is the City of Washington in the State of Virginia.<sup>8</sup>

The fragmentary Diary recounts, in detail, though with many gaps due to mutilation of the manuscript, the journey from some point in Tennessee to Washington, the stay in Washington, and the return to Natchitoches. The *Report to Congress* tells this part of the story in less detail. It supplements the Diary by telling of his subsequent activities, up to August 1, 1815.

Recruiting and organizing a troop of four hundred volunteers,<sup>9</sup> he marched into Texas in August, 1812. Gathering new recruits along the way, he took successively Nacogdoches, Bahía del Espíritu Santo (Goliad) in February, 1813, and Béxar (San Antonio) in April. A provisional government was formed at Béxar, Gutiérrez de Lara being elected "Governor of the State and Commander of the Army". On April 6, 1813, the independence of Texas was "solemnly declared".

He did not remain in power long; dissensions and intrigue, in which José Alvarez de Toledo<sup>10</sup> and the American officers<sup>11</sup> were prominent conspirators, forced him out of office. Warned of plots against his life, he left on August 6, 1813, bearing a letter from Arocha, president of the cabildo of Béxar, commanding him to mer-

<sup>8</sup> *Lamar Papers*, I. 8-9. Gutiérrez's description of Washington as being in Virginia was a natural error for a stranger, unacquainted with the country or its language. The District of Columbia did in 1811 still contain the land ceded to the federal government by Virginia, as it did for thirty-five years following. Washington, however, was wholly on the eastern, or Maryland side, of the Potomac River.

<sup>9</sup> Gutiérrez calls none of these recruits by name. He distinguishes Americans, Creoles, and Indians. Other accounts mention Ross, Perry, Augustus W. Magee, Kemper, Lockett, James Gaines, etc., as Americans prominent in the expedition. See Yoakum, *History of Texas*, vol. I., chs. XII., XIII.; Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, vol. II., ch. II., etc.

<sup>10</sup> Toledo, according to Gutiérrez, had been working and plotting against the latter ever since their meeting while "in the government of the north" in 1811 and 1812; even going so far as to hire assassins to kill him. *Lamar Papers*, I. 15 *et seq.*

<sup>11</sup> Gutiérrez characterizes the Americans as "mostly doctors and lawyers, gifted in all matters, especially the matter of rascality". American accounts attribute the disaffection of the Americans to disgust with Gutiérrez's barbarous treatment of Royalist prisoners. See Bancroft, *op. cit.*, II. 25; Yoakum, *op. cit.*, I. 169-172. For a defense of Gutiérrez in this connection, see Garza, *Dos Hermanos Héroes*, p. 53 *et seq.* Garza represents him as being helpless against popular clamor instigated by agents of Toledo and Captain William Shaler. Gutiérrez mentions as a confederate of Toledo "an agent of the government of the north, a man of great genius, but also a great scoundrel", apparently referring to Shaler. *Lamar Papers*, I. 17.

chants of Louisiana, and requesting them to furnish him and his family a decent house and subsistence, for which they would be reimbursed by the government of Texas.<sup>12</sup> He was afterward joined in Natchitoches by his family, and here they lived until after the close of the War of Independence. According to Garza, he made his own and his family's living during 1813 and part of 1814 by working as a mechanic.

He went to New Orleans in April, 1814, and tried to secure money and recruits for the cause of independence, both in the United States and in foreign countries. He reports to the Revolutionary Congress of Mexico, for instance, a filibustering scheme of certain demobilized soldiers of General Jackson's army, which he at first favored but afterward disavowed for lack of confidence in their motives; he tells of sending an agent to Puerto Principe, Haiti, to try to get French troops and a French loan; of his own hope to go to England in the interest of the Revolution, etc.

From the Gutiérrez de Lara papers and Dr. Garza's biography, both already cited, we learn that he continued his revolutionary activities in exile throughout the War of Independence. In his capacity as *generalísimo* of the Northern Provinces he is said to have issued numerous privateer's commissions, the holders of which preyed upon Spanish shipping to such an extent as seriously to cripple Spanish trade and war transportation. He attempted personally no further military invasion, but continued recruiting volunteers; coöperating from the outside with other patriots, notably Captain Menchaca, Juan Cortés, Santiago Dill, Francisco Xavier Mina, Dr. José Manuel de Herrera. At the same time he also continued his efforts to keep the Indian tribes in line. He apparently became so interested in the Indian policy which he conceived and formulated that he stayed in Natchitoches for two years after Iturbide's *coup* had won independence for Mexico, trying unsuccessfully to arouse official and popular interest in his schemes for their subjugation.

He returned to Mexico, after hearing of the installation, on November 7, 1823, of the Constituent Congress. Thereafter his connection is rather with general Mexican history than with the history of the southwestern United States. Shortly after his return he was elected *diputado suplente* of the Constituent Congress of Tamaulipas, the Congress afterward electing him governor of the state.<sup>13</sup> He

<sup>12</sup> Arocha to the "Señores habitantes del Comercio del Puerto de Natchitoches", Aug. 5, 1813. Gutiérrez de Lara papers.

<sup>13</sup> Secretary of the Congress to Gutiérrez de Lara, July 15, 1824; and Gutiérrez's letter of acceptance, July 16. Gutiérrez de Lara papers; printed in *Dos Hermanos Héroes*, pp. 132-133.

held this position less than a year, resigning on March 4, 1825, as a result of objection to his holding a civil and a military office simultaneously. He had been appointed in November, 1824, as veteran colonel of the regiment of cavalry militia to be organized in Tamaulipas, with ten years' seniority, in recognition of his patriotic services.<sup>14</sup> From May to December, 1825, he served as *ad interim comandante general* of the Eastern Interior Provinces.

In his last years he suffered the bitterness of poverty, political persecution, and broken health. In 1839, two years before his death, he rendered, in behalf of the National Government, active military service in Guerrero against a rebel attack. He was captured and his house looted by the rebels in October, 1839; he was, however, set at liberty in Mier shortly afterward.<sup>15</sup> The injury done to his already infirm health by the campaign and the subsequent imprisonment doubtless hastened the end, which came on May 13, 1841, in the course of a journey for the purpose of visiting his married children and of improving his health.<sup>16</sup>

Obviously the fragments of the Diary here printed present only a small part of Gutiérrez de Lara's public life or even of his mission to the United States. Just what dates mark the beginning and the end of the complete manuscript it is now of course impossible to tell; several months of the journey, however, are unrecorded in the fragment as it now stands.

The Diary is of interest principally as showing the impression made upon a fresh, open mind in the course of his travels. The writer is continually struck with the wonder and the greatness of the country; its industrial life; its rapidly growing cities; its social advancement; the good fortune of its citizens in living under so good and benevolent a government. He wonders at the beauty of children at whose parents' house he spends the night; he comments upon the young stage-drivers, with their "faces like roses, and their bodies as if they were painted". He wonders at the religious fervor of the Methodist campmeeting goers and prays for the enlightenment which they so earnestly seek.

His impressions are not always favorable: individuals not infrequently irritate him, or shock him, or rouse him to fury; he is disappointed at the failure of the United States government to embrace whole-heartedly the proffered opportunity to help the Mexican struggle for liberty.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 155, 160.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 190-191.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.

He seems naively pleased with the honors accorded him, officially and personally—honors which his imperfect understanding of the language and of the customs of the country sometimes led him to exaggerate. Allowing for this exaggeration, however, the response of some whose hospitality he enjoyed was no doubt genuine, partly because of interest in the man himself, partly because of the glamorous appeal of the cause which he represented.

An attempt to gather from contemporary evidence material for an accurate appraisal of Gutiérrez presents somewhat the same difficulty as gathering from contemporary evidence material for a temperate estimate of Andrew Jackson. Both men ran too much to extremes of temper and conduct to be easily judged impartially; nor did the time in which they lived conduce to calmness of judgment. A few conclusions, however, seem fairly deducible from Gutiérrez de Lara's own writing.

He was undoubtedly high-tempered; he permitted, if he did not order, cruelty in the treatment of prisoners of war. He was inclined to extremes of judgment. He had limitations, partly inherent, partly due to lack of education and experience; he took himself too seriously. He was capable on occasion of dissimulation.

It is equally certain, however, that he had native mental ability, restless energy, courage, resourcefulness, strength of will. He must have had personal force, even charm, for, coming to the United States penniless, without credentials, he was able to inspire confidence in high places even to the extent of being able to borrow money on his personal note. Moreover, his patriotism must have been genuine, for self-seeking ambition is hardly sufficient to explain his continued fidelity to the insurgent cause in the face of discouragement, privation, and ill-fortune.

On the whole, he played an important part in the history of the southwestern United States even though he apparently attracted little attention in the larger movements in Mexico. It is unfortunate therefore that so few of his papers seem to have been preserved, and it is to be hoped that more will come to light.

ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST.

[Nov. 2, 1811] . . . [Some of these Indians wear]<sup>17</sup> a frock coat of cloth of good quality (*páño de primcra*), rather long, without trousers or shoes; others wear a shirt of very fine holland long enough to reach to their feet, without anything else. From here we went on, spending the night in the house of a moderately well-to-do Indian, who treated us with much courtesy and served us a supper of fried pork and a great deal of coffee. The platters, plates, cups, coffee-pots, and sugar-bowls, were all

<sup>17</sup> Indians living in what is now the northeastern part of Mississippi. The traveller was following the Natchez Trace.

of china; there were good forks and knives of steel. The Indian and his wife seated themselves at the table, and I was pleased to see the dexterity with which they used the knife and fork. Because of the heavy rain, we were here until the next day, at twelve by the Indian's watch.

3. We left here, and spent the night in a dense thicket about five leagues farther on. I must not forget what happened to us in the Indian's house a little before we set out: Some Englishmen<sup>18</sup> arrived in company with a doctor, and one of them wished to buy from me the three mare-mules and a horse-mule which I had with me. As soon as he saw the three mare-mules, he said, "Good! Here are three mares and this other is a stallion", speaking in reference to the horse-mule; and he asked me if I would trade him the three mare-mules, saying that he would breed them to a burro and raise a great many mules.<sup>19</sup>

4. We set out from the thicket and went to the house of an Indian to get corn for the mules. We bought fresh venison at a *real*<sup>20</sup> a pound, as is the custom in that country, be it goat's flesh, pork, or whatever else. When we had travelled a little way, an Englishman overtook us; as soon as he saw the horse which the interpreter was riding, he asked if that animal was a burro; we told him no, it was a Spanish horse. And there is no doubt that there is a great difference, for these [American] horses are extremely tall and very well formed, so that it is a pleasure to see them; so well filled out [as they are] and so fine looking that I have never seen their like. A few leagues farther on we crossed the Bear River (*Rio de los Osos*);<sup>21</sup> it is rather wide, but we passed over, as the water was low. Its waters are black. There is an Indian village here. We passed the night at the house of a rich Indian whose slave quarters looked like a little village. His house was several stories high, all very well built. He would not let us pay for our food. He had a great many peacocks.

5. We set out from here and arrived about 10 o'clock at the bank of the Tennessee River. Here lives a rich Indian<sup>22</sup> who took us across the river, and whose house looks like a country palace with its abundance of glass in doors and windows. This Indian is the owner of two ferry-boats (*chalanes*) which ply on this great river; he makes a great deal of money. This Tennessee River bears the same name as the province through which it runs; it is very deep; its waters are dark; it is a quarter of a league wide; it flows westward, and a little farther on it runs into the Ohio (*Fallo*) River. The Cumberland River also flows into this Ohio (*Fallo*) River; all three are of the same size, and uniting in a mighty stream all flow into the Mississippi a little below the Yslas Negras.<sup>23</sup> All these rivers are navigable. We slept in the house of a poor Indian.

<sup>18</sup> Apparently English, here and elsewhere in the Diary, means English-speaking, or Anglo-American.

<sup>19</sup> Here, as in several other cases, the diarist is apparently the unconscious victim of a "tenderfoot" joke.

<sup>20</sup> One-eighth of a dollar or twelve and a half cents.

<sup>21</sup> Big Bear Creek, which the road crossed near the northern end of the present Alabama-Mississippi boundary.

<sup>22</sup> George Colbert, who owned the ferry across the Tennessee, in the Chickasaw country, at the lower end of the Muscle Shoals. See *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. Bassett, I, 323 n.

<sup>23</sup> The meaning is not wholly clear. There was a district in Upper Louisiana called Yslas Negras; the reference here, however, seems to be to some specific point on the Mississippi River. See Hatcher, p. 167 and note.

6. Setting out from here we fell in with many families that were going down to settle in Mobile and Pensacola. We spent the night in a dense grove of chestnut trees. Today we followed a very hilly road.

7. We set out from here, and about 11 o'clock we arrived at Buffalo Creek (*Arollo de Sibolo*), which contains a great deal of water. A little farther on, we crossed the boundary line of the Indian country, and entered the land of the Americans.<sup>24</sup> We spent the night in the house of a poor American who had three children; these were working at spinning and weaving cotton until midnight. These children were absolutely perfect in face and form, and as white as the very snow, so that I wondered at seeing them.

8. I set out from here over a hilly road. About four leagues distant we forded Duck River (*Rio de los Patos*), and we spent the night at the inn of an Englishman.<sup>25</sup> Here I was taken with a fever and terrific headache, but the landlady, seeing that I was a foreigner, took pity on me and put me to sleep on a feather bed; and while I was asleep, [she put an aromatic herb]<sup>26</sup> on my pillow because it was a good remedy for headache. I knew nothing of the remedy until I got up the next day, still a little sick.

9. We set out from here and six leagues farther on we passed by the village of Franklin (*Franklé*) a very pretty village. We travelled on, and found almost all the road bordered with ranches and farms. We arrived at the town of Nashville (*Neshfil*), which is a town of considerable importance. All its houses are of several stories. The church is in the midst of the plaza; it is square in shape, with a second story of the same form. The jail is next to the church; it is fork-shaped (*en forma de orca*)<sup>27</sup> with a platform above. At a man's height is a pillory in which offenders are placed in sight of all the people. I lodged in a tavern.

Sunday, the 10th, I stayed here, suffering the greatest inconvenience.

11. I stayed here, still deeply impressed with the malevolence of men, and how unhappy human weakness makes us; praying to God all the while

<sup>24</sup> Compared with a map of the Indian cessions to the United States under treaties negotiated before 1811, this statement is hardly accurate. Since the Cherokee treaty of Jan. 7, 1806, the Tennessee was the boundary. See C. C. Royce, *Indian Land Cessions*, pl. CLXI. Gutiérrez doubtless based his statement upon the fact that he encountered no Indians after this time.

<sup>25</sup> At what is now Columbia, Tenn.

<sup>26</sup> Several words being so thoroughly deleted in the original as to render them completely illegible, the bracketed words are editorially conjectured to fill out the sense.

<sup>27</sup> The meaning is not quite clear. The Spanish may signify "gallows-shaped", or "fork-shaped". The design of the building might be  or . The latter figure would resemble an old-fashioned two-tined pitch-fork.

A typical pioneer house consisted of two cabins of hewn logs having between them an open passage-way without doors, with one roof covering both the cabins and the passage. The prison may have been of this form, the passage forming the platform (*tablado*) mentioned by the writer. Or the platform may have been in front of the whole building.

John Trotwood Moore, librarian and archivist of Tennessee, quotes from Crew's *History of Nashville* as follows: "The first jail was also on the public square—a log house between twenty and thirty feet each way, and there was a pillory and a whipping-post near by."

as I said to spare us from being for a moment outside the pale of His holy grace.<sup>28</sup>

12. I was still here against my will because of some happenings which I shall recount to my friends as soon as God wills to let me return to my country. I had omitted to say that this village is on the bank of the Cumberland River. Because of the great traffic that moves up and down this river goods are very cheap. An arroba<sup>29</sup> of superior tobacco is worth a dollar; a pair of pantaloons made of a kind of cotton<sup>30</sup> that lasts a long time I have seen sell for a dollar and a half; a fine handkerchief at three or four reals. The cost of food for man and beast, however, is very great; so much so that for two men and five beasts the innkeeper charged me fifteen dollars for three days.

13. I set out from this infernal house. I must attribute to the Frenchman, my interpreter, the beginning of all my troubles. I should not have enough paper to write of his villany and infamy; but in passing I shall say something of him. He was a contemptible runt; his face and eyes were like a cat's; and it would be well for every man to free himself of all persons of this quality and calibre. About four leagues distant we crossed a stream which is called Rock River (*un rio que llaman de las piedras*).<sup>31</sup> We slept in the house of an Englishman who was fairly well to do, but his wife had no shoes, wearing the old ones which he discarded. But this accords with the way the most of them treat their wives, whom they keep at work incessantly.

14. We set out from here with the intention of reaching today the house of General Thomas Overton,<sup>32</sup> to whom I bear a letter of introduction. Who knows but that they accord to persons recommended to them the same treatment as to their women? We came to the house of the said general, and his wife received us with much cordiality—and kept on knitting stockings. Presently came the General, to whom I gave the letter. He was very cordial; he exchanged compliments with me like a well-bred person of the first rank. This gentleman is one of the generals who fought against the British arms;<sup>33</sup> he took part in thirty battles; his whole body is full of signs of the wounds which he received in these battles until the [Americans] achieved their independence. It is a pleasure to see the decoration of this gentleman's house, upstairs and down. They entertained us with an ostentatious table and sumptuous beds.

15. I arose at daybreak in the said house, and the General began to write me a letter of introduction to another general at whose house I shall go to sleep tonight; another letter to a brother of his<sup>34</sup> who is in Knox-

<sup>28</sup> The meaning is somewhat obscure. Gutiérrez de Lara's evident worry and discouragement is doubtless the result of an unhappy combination of circumstances—the interpreter's defection, shortage of money, the "happenings" noted in the entry for the twelfth, travel-weariness in an unaccustomed climate, an unknown and non-Catholic country.

<sup>29</sup> 25.3 pounds avoirdupois.

<sup>30</sup> Probably nankeen.

<sup>31</sup> Stone River.

<sup>32</sup> Mr. Moore describes General Overton's house as having been "at Hunter's Hill in the bend of the Cumberland River, about twelve miles from Nashville, and . . . now known as the Old Hickory Powder Plant".

<sup>33</sup> Lieutenant, 9th Virginia Regiment; captain, 4th Continental Dragoons.

<sup>34</sup> John Overton, a prominent lawyer of early Tennessee, at this time judge in the supreme court of the state.

ville, capital of this province, and another letter for the farmers along the road, requesting them to take care of my mules and show me the way. He is preparing to go with me in person to guide me two leagues. All this is because of his great generosity, as also because of my interpreter's unwillingness to go with me, and the consequent necessity for my going alone. The general set out accompanying me, and went with me for almost three leagues; he took leave of me and I went on alone. We had previously crossed the Cumberland. After a little I passed by a village the name of which I had no one to ask, because no one understood me, nor I them either. In the afternoon I arrived at the mansion<sup>35</sup> of General Winchester (*Wahnstan*) who received me with great cordiality and politeness. He ordered his slaves to look after my mules, and conducted me to a rich chamber where were his wife and children, by whom I was received with the greatest politeness. After a little they laid the cloth on a rich table. The general, seating himself in the first place, had me sit at the second place, at his right; and when the dishes were placed the General served the first plate and placed it before me, and Mrs. Winchester served the tea. An hour later, after a great supper, they took me to a chamber in an upper story, whose rich decorations and sumptuous beds proclaimed the wealth of the owner.

16. Day broke without any unusual happening except that I was buried in a luxurious feather bed. I stayed here today because it was raining at daybreak and continued to rain all day. I have been served by everybody. I have occupied myself in making sketches for the children; and for this reason and because they kept asking me the name of everything in Spanish, they were continually around me—which tired me—except when the General came in and scolded them, saying that they must not annoy me. Night came; and when it was bedtime, they gave me a lighted candle and the General another, and we went to our rooms to go to bed. I was seized with a desire to go down to the corral, and I started out. The General's little girls, who were in a room next to mine, heard me; and the elder dressed herself like a lay brother, in a cape (*capingón*), and knelt down with her arms stretched out (*en forma de cruz*) to frighten me. I saw the figure and immediately recognized who it was, but I would not carry the joke any further, in order not to make a noise and disturb the General, who was not yet asleep. It is a pleasure to see how merry these people are. I say people, supposing all the farmers are alike, as everywhere. Day broke without any unusual happening; there was no rain, but the cold was terrific. I wanted to go on, but the General kept me here until we had dined; afterward he gave me a letter of introduction to all the houses along the road, and sent an official<sup>36</sup> to guide me for a league. I took leave of everybody and set out.

Sunday, 17th. I travelled all day through settled country, in a cold so terrific that I thought I should lose all my fingers and toes. And this is what they call a hot country here! It will be like this for 300 leagues farther which I have yet to go; and I have already travelled nine hundred and eighty. I arrived in the evening, and spent the night, at the house of

<sup>35</sup> Mr. Moore identifies this "mansion" as Cragfont, the home of General James Winchester, still standing "about ten miles from Gallatin and on the road to Knoxville", and about 25 miles beyond General Overton's. A biography of General Winchester by Judge John De Witt is printed in the *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, June and September, 1915.

<sup>36</sup> Probably the general's plantation overseer.

an old farmer who was so grasping and thievish that he would not give me my supper until I had shown him the money. He was of the calibre of the interpreter; he too was a contemptible runt; and he was half-drunk to boot (*de pilón*). After we went to bed he and the old woman began to fight; and it seemed that each had a devil in his body; but I believe the old man has an army of them, as the saying goes. They did not let me get to sleep until midnight. . . . After this experience I think I shall measure them; and if they are too short I shall pass on.

18. Day broke, the world white with snow. I waited to set out from here until the sun should come up a little, though the sun is very far toward the south. Seeing that the snow was not melting, I travelled through the hills, which are not high, but very inconvenient [travelling].<sup>37</sup> The road is good, however, since it is a public highway (*echo a fuerza de barra*) for many leagues. About noon I crossed the Cumberland and passed a settlement whose name I did not know. I spent the night at the farm of some poor people where they gave me for supper ham cooked with cabbage leaves and so ill seasoned that I could not endure it.

19. I set out from here without breakfast, because I did not care to breakfast on filth; and I spent the night in an inn (inns be damned!). As soon as I arrived a servant bade me alight, and then went away; and I stayed in the porch freezing with the cold, my mules tied, without knowing what to do, because there was no one to ask; for the cursed landlady was inside the closed door. About the time of evening prayer she came and opened the door, barely deigned to invite me to enter, and turned her back on me with great promptitude. To characterize this jade in two words I shall say that she was an innkeeper and presumed upon her good looks. (Damn inn-keepers!)

20. I was here all day, because it began to rain at daybreak. It annoyed me greatly to be here in the inn; even though the presumptuous landlady took pains to prepare me good meals and a very good bed, but in order to ingratiate herself. This cursed woman had the impudence to send an Englishman with a negro maid to my room where I was already asleep; the maid waked me and said that her mistress said that I should let that man sleep in the bed with me. It infuriated me and I ordered them out, at which they laughed uproariously. It is customary in these inns to put two men in one bed and charge the same as if one were sleeping alone.

21. I set out from here and spent the night at the house of an Englishman, who as soon as he found out that I was from New Spain treated me with great cordiality. They say that in these far countries they have never seen another man from the realm (*reyno*) of Mexico, as I am.

22. I set out from here over the snow, and about noon I came to a ridge and climbed a high slope (*cuesta*). The most of it is a corduroy road (*ademada con madera*) in order to afford passage for the innumerable carts that travel this way. Only today I have fallen in with about fifty of them, all laden with families going down to the South. I spent the night at the house of a shoemaker, where I and my mules fared very well; and he would hardly take pay.

23. I set out from here over the ridge, up hill and down dale. Yet there was a very good road, for the most of it is a public highway, and

<sup>37</sup> The writer seems to mean that he took a hill-road, rather than a valley-road, to avoid the deep snowdrifts in the valley. The hill was not very high, but travelling over the hill-road was not comfortable.

the most of the depressions are corduroy roads. About three in the afternoon I crossed the Clinch (*Cuinchá*) River in a ferryboat (*chalán*). It is very broad and deep (*caudaloso*). There is a settlement here, and there are settlers all along the banks. I spent the night at the house of an Englishman, one of the kind who have something to eat.

[Sunday] 24th. I remained here because it suddenly began to rain. All this family was very kindly, but there was among them a cripple (*cojo*) who, in a word, was possessed of a devil.

25. I set out from here in a drizzle of rain (*medio lloviendo*), suffering the inconvenience which I have suffered all these days of my journey, of finding all the road almost covered with carts. I spent the night at the house of an Englishman. A little while afterward a captain came thither to spend the night; when he read my letters of introduction he outdid himself in compliments, and could not find terms in which to express his desire of serving me.

26. I set out from here, and about 11 o'clock I came to Knoxville (*Noxfil*) the capital of this province of Tennessee (*Tenesé*), and to the house of General Overton's brother,<sup>38</sup> to whom I brought a letter of introduction. He received me with great cordiality (*agrado*) and immediately went and told the Governor<sup>39</sup> of Tennessee, who promptly came to greet me and offer me his services. This was the house where the Governor boarded. Soon they laid the covers, and we ate a very hearty meal with a very brilliant company (*con acompañamiento mui lucido*). When the meal was over, the Governor took my hand and conducted me to his house, where I stayed all day until supper time; and here I slept.

27. Day broke without any unusual occurrence. I began negotiating to sell the mules in order to travel by coach; and fortunately sold them this very day, receiving 130 pesos for the four. I was paid in Spanish doubloons at 15 pesos to the ounce (*onza*);<sup>40</sup> which is all they are worth here. Today they had me go to the house where the lawyers interpret the laws of the government, and I was much entertained at seeing new things.

28. Day dawned upon me here, waiting for the public coaches which will come within four days; and I shall go forward to the capital (*corte*) of this country (*reyno*). Today I walked to a large factory for osnaburg (*cotonso grueso*)<sup>41</sup> which they make of hemp (*cañamo*); I was greatly diverted in watching such great machines in operation.

29. The Governor gave me a letter of introduction for the capital, and another gentleman gave me three letters to the same capital; one of them is to the President of the Congress.<sup>42</sup>

30. The Governor and I amused ourselves for some little while, he in teaching me English, I in teaching him Spanish. I am moving with leaden footsteps in learning, because I have no interpreter.

<sup>38</sup> John Overton. See note 32, above.

<sup>39</sup> Willie Blount (1767-1835), governor of Tennessee 1809-1815.

<sup>40</sup> Compare the entry for Mar. 17, 1812, below. *Onza* and *doblón* were used interchangeably.

<sup>41</sup> Osnaburg, coarse cloth of flax and tow.

<sup>42</sup> Probably to Henry Clay, speaker of the House. Clay was more likely to have been personally known to a Tennessean than was George Clinton, vice-president of the United States and president of the Senate.

December.

Sunday, 1st. They say that the coach in which I shall go day after tomorrow may come tomorrow. Here in this house I have been very pleasantly situated, because it is a house characterized by high standing, civility, a good table, a good bed, rational conversation; it has been like being in the house of the governor of Tennessee. Today two pieces of bad news reached the Governor, one from the Congress, and the other from Kentucky (*Quintoque*). The latter report is to the effect that the Shawnee (*Shonas*) Indians have declared war, and have entered Kentucky 1200 strong, have fought with the troops and killed 180 soldiers, while only 80 of the Indians were killed.<sup>43</sup> But the President is ordering a large number of troops to march against them, with orders to destroy the nation. The other report is that Great Britain has declared war against this American power, and the declaration is dreaded. On the heels of this the President issues proclamations, calling upon all the provinces to mobilize;<sup>44</sup> and the Governor tells me that today they are casting great quantities of cannon in all the provinces in order to guard the entire coast.

2. I am still here, but tomorrow I shall set out for the capital. Today I entertained myself by going to the office or house where the government archives are filed, and where the papers of the government are sealed. I was also in the postoffice.

3. About ten the coach arrived and I got into it; and, drawn by four horses, we began to travel with great speed. In this coach are transported the mail and the newspapers; these were thrown out at the doors of the subscribers living on the side of the road. We spent the night at the house of an Englishman.

4. I set out from here and toward noon I passed two places where there was a postoffice; at one of these I changed coach, horses and coachman. I spent the night at a public house (*publi Jaus*).

5. We set out from here, and about 11 o'clock we came to a place where I took the other mail coach which was there ready. About 8 o'clock at night we passed through another town of some importance—we were now in the province of Virginia; the coachman drove on (*coló*) until twelve at night, when we stopped half an hour while I took supper. They got horses ready immediately; another Englishman [came on], and he travelled until daybreak.

6. The coach continued after dawn (*con el dia*), and about 11 o'clock we came to the place where I ate. They promptly got ready for me a horse, upon which I mounted and went with an Englishman who took me five leagues to a place where was the coach in which I was to travel. All the stage-drivers have been boys of eighteen or twenty years, and their faces are like roses, and their bodies as if they were painted. The stage-coach was not at the five-league point, but at fourteen.<sup>45</sup> We caught it at dawn.

<sup>43</sup> The battle of Tippecanoe was fought on Nov. 7, 1811. As Harrison retreated immediately after it, the first rumors were to the effect that he had been defeated.

<sup>44</sup> No proclamation by President Madison between July 24, 1811, and Feb. 7, 1812, is noted in Richardson. Perhaps his message to Congress, of Nov. 5, 1811, is meant.

<sup>45</sup> Probably the writer means that the distance, estimated at five leagues, was really fourteen leagues. The necessity of his travelling the whole afternoon and night to reach the point of junction seems to bear out this supposition.

7. I got into the coach and started. We passed by one town, and came to another about 11 o'clock at night. At this hour they got horses ready for me and for the mail carrier, because the stage was broken. Before daybreak we crossed a broad, deep river in a ferryboat (*chalan*), and a little after we crossed another as wide as the Rio Grande; this we crossed over a wooden bridge, very well made. After this we passed through two towns; in one of them they gave us a change of horses.

8. [Sunday]. We went on, and we passed through two villages. About 11 o'clock at night we came to a very large town, where the coach was ready; and I went on immediately. A little while afterward we passed through two other places where they gave us a remount.

9. We passed through two places, and about three in the afternoon we came to an important trading settlement. Here I stopped to sleep (*quedé a dormir*) for it had been five nights since I had slept, because these stagecoaches do not stop. Here, however, by chance it was not ready until morning. In this place is an Andalusian, who had me brought to his house without knowing who I was; or perhaps he thought to do me a favor. At any rate he did do so; he was the first to tell me that the Creoles of the realm of Mexico were a set of fools.

10. I set out from here at three A.M. and passed through two settlements; about 12 o'clock we passed through another, where we ate. I and the two gentlemen who went with me in the stage. This town<sup>46</sup> is on the bank of a broad, deep river, and on the bank the houses have their foundations set in the water. All these houses on the bank are four stories high; they are full of different machines which are operated by water power; and they are so numerous that nearly all the water is used. I marvelled at seeing how these men worked and the good fortune (*alivio*) which is theirs by reason of the advanced stage of industry (*por tener facilidades todas las artes*). All this well-being comes to this nation as the result of having a good government. O that I could say as much! We crossed this river over a large bridge and came to a city called Alexandria, which is a seaport. As soon as we came in sight of the port we saw some ships entering the harbor under full sail. We crossed an inlet about 500 varas<sup>47</sup> broad over a great bridge, and each of us paid toll. I walked about the streets all the afternoon seeing large buildings and many remarkable things.

11. At three in the morning I set out for the city of Washington (*Guazinton*), which is about three leagues<sup>48</sup> from here. We crossed three wooden bridges, one of which was probably 800 varas<sup>49</sup> long, and we came to the said capital of the province of Virginia,<sup>50</sup> and at this time of all the nation, because the Congress meets here every year at this time. It is a great city;<sup>51</sup> it is a seaport; there are many great houses constructed for the government, for the benefit and happiness of its inhabitants. At 11 o'clock I entered the palace in which is the office of the

<sup>46</sup> Apparently Fredericksburg, Va.

<sup>47</sup> *I.e.*, somewhat over a quarter-mile.

<sup>48</sup> *I.e.*, about seven or eight miles.

<sup>49</sup> *I.e.*, between a third- and a half-mile.

<sup>50</sup> See note 8, above.

<sup>51</sup> This comment could have been seriously made only by one who, like Gutiérrez, lived in a very sparsely settled country. The census of 1810 records only 8210 inhabitants; in 1812 the population could hardly have been much over 9,000. Moreover, Washington was commonly described at this time and for more than half a century afterward in some such terms as "a straggling village".

Secretary of War (*Secretario de Guerra y del Despacho Universal*),<sup>52</sup> by whom I was received with the greatest cordiality. In the two hours that I was with him we discussed various matters, and we made an appointment for tomorrow. The chief clerk (*escrivano*)<sup>53</sup> took me to his apartment and I was with him an hour.

12. At twelve I went to His Excellency's house, and we discussed various matters. He asked my opinion as to whether, if he should send an army to take possession of Nacogdoches, bad results would ensue; and my opinion was that they would. He told me that it would be easy to send an army to the banks of the Rio Grande under the pretext that they were going to take possession of the lands which France had sold to them, and that being there the army could help the Creoles. I told him no; although he made me see that in no other way could they give aid, because they were today at peace with all nations. I told him that the aid I asked should be given in such a way as would benefit both Americas. My way of thinking did not displease the government; he gratified me by saying that our cause was favored by all this nation (*reyno*); that they would aid me to defend it; and he promised to give me money for the necessities of life, because he knew I was poorly supplied, and also for my transportation to my country. The chief clerk and I went through all the halls and offices of the Palace. O how admirable an edifice! [It is a delight] merely to see so many admirable things. If I should set myself to write [about] all [that I see] and the admirable order of everything which these men have done, a great deal of time and paper would be required. But I shall content myself with saying that a good government makes a happy nation.

13. I went to the Palace and was with the chief clerk; we discussed various matters. He showed me a paper from Cádiz dated July 11, 1811, in which he says the offer of Great Britain is cited in reference to using her forces to compel the colonies of Spain to swear obedience to the Junta of the Cortes. The chief clerk also gave me the terrible news that he had read a letter which had come from New Orleans, and which said that the American troops who had gone with Colonel Menchaca<sup>54</sup> had returned because the latter had gone over to the side of the Gachupins;<sup>55</sup> I argued the contrary, however, saying that Menchaca was a man of integrity (*hombre de bien*) and that it was not possible for him to behave thus; that surely the letter had been composed by some scoundrel.<sup>56</sup> He told me also that the deputy from Caracas is here; that he is a European; for the Europeans who were in that country were on the side of independence; he had come for the purpose of buying arms. Here also are the Am-

<sup>52</sup> William Eustis of Massachusetts, Secretary of War 1809-1813. For an account of the negotiations of Gutiérrez with the secretaries of War and State (Monroe) see I. J. Cox, "Monroe and the Early Mexican Revolutionary Agents", in the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1911, I. 199-215.

<sup>53</sup> John Graham.

<sup>54</sup> See the introduction.

<sup>55</sup> Royalists, so called because they were mostly Spaniards; the word Gachupin meaning primarily a Spaniard settled in America.

<sup>56</sup> Gutiérrez's statement regarding this information in the *Report* is: "News came to the government that Menchaca had played turncoat because of the offers of the Gachupines." In view of it he feels impelled to hurry to the frontier. Apparently he had lost in 1815 the faith in Menchaca which he had so stoutly maintained in 1811.

bassador of Bonaparte<sup>57</sup> and the Ambassador of Great Britain.<sup>58</sup> I walked over to the printing office, and from there I went to see and admire the great house in which all the Congress assembles for its deliberations (*se junta à hacer Audiencia*). I had omitted to say that when I was asked to give my opinion as to whether or not it would be well to go to take possession of the lands as far as the Rio Grande according to the terms of the French sale, and after my opinion was entirely opposed to this suggestion, I made them this proposition: That it seemed to me very desirable to leave a certain portion of land as a neutral [tract], to separate the two nations, or Americas, for thereby would be obviated many discords which commonly result from the close contact of two powers. Furthermore I suggested to them that both governments ought to reflect maturely over this particular, and to call to mind the troubous conditions arising from discords, even though they be light, between two republics or crowned heads; for unhappily these rarely compose their difficulties rationally (*con razones*); it is always more to their liking to take up arms; and, I said, this procedure always results in the ruin of the powers. My way of thinking appealed strongly to the government, who expressed approbation.

14. I set out to walk through the city, and as I was going through a certain street, an Englishman took me by the hand and conducted me to a church where there was no altar but the High Altar and the Crucified Savior in the midst.<sup>59</sup> In the afternoon there came to visit me in my room three members of the Congress; they put me into a showy carriage and we went to visit Señor Deoria,<sup>60</sup> the deputy from Caracas. Though he was—as he appeared to me—a man of great sophistication (*maduréz*), I perceived that he is not free from a certain [characteristically] arrogant and haughty spirit; nevertheless he was not willing for me to address him as Your Excellency (*no quiso que lo tratase de ucia*), and he offered himself as my interpreter. God forbid!

15. I went to the Secretary's office, and they laid before me their intention of going to take possession of the said lands. They said that I should present to the government in writing all that I knew of the revolution of New Spain and of the cause of my coming to this capital, because this government is greatly interested in favoring our cause: that in any case I should give in writing my opinion in reference to the intention of this government to take possession of the said lands; [saying] that they had not taken possession before because the Spanish government had placed obstacles in the way; but that all was cleared up, because before Spain had taken possession France had occupied the port of San Bernardino.<sup>61</sup> My reply to them was that I could not vote upon these things,

<sup>57</sup> Louis Sérurier, minister to the United States Feb. 21, 1811-Jan. 22, 1816.

<sup>58</sup> Augustus John Foster, minister to the United States 1811-1812.

<sup>59</sup> Probably St. Patrick's Church, a frame structure on F Street between Ninth and Tenth.

<sup>60</sup> I.e., Telésforo de Orea, the form of the name given on p. 75.

<sup>61</sup> I.e., the present Matagorda Bay, into which the Colorado River flows. On the Garcitas River, near the present Lavaca Bay, an arm of Matagorda Bay, La Salle made in 1685 his unsuccessful attempt to found a French colony, supposedly at the mouth of the Mississippi River. De Leon's official report of his expedition of 1689, in the course of which he discovered the bay and the ruined French settlement, gives the name Bahia del Espíritu Santo, apparently to the bay as a whole. The map of the expedition, however, is entitled "Camino que el año de 1689 hizo

nor could they treat of them with me; that only the Supreme Government could decide them; but even after this they wish my opinion. Maria Santísima, help me and rescue me from these men!<sup>62</sup>

16. I went to the Palace of the President, and he received me with great courtesy. I was with him very little, because he does not understand Spanish. The grandeur of this palace aroused my admiration—the perfect (*prodigioso*) order of its very rich furniture; so many different lamps of crystal ornamented with fine gold. Outside it has only windows of fine glass—one hundred and two of them.

17. I went to the Secretary's office and was conducted into the presence of the Secretary of State<sup>63</sup> with whom I discussed the matters which I had in hand; and to him I presented my (*los*) papers. He told me that it was expedient for me to go back to my country to fetch the documents necessary to undertake the purchase of arms, and to report the friendly disposition of this country to favor the Republic of Mexico. He told me also, that so great was the extent to which he was interesting himself in this cause, that as soon as I presented myself and made my reports this government immediately wrote to its ambassadors in France, England, and Denmark<sup>64</sup> in order to charge them to bend all their energies (*pongan todo su empeño*) toward showing (*hacerles ver*) those powers how expedient it is for them that all the colonies of Spain become independent. Yesterday, moreover, he told me that they had laid the matter before Mr. Foster (*Foste*) the Ambassador of Great Britain, and had set forth that the conduct of Great Britain nowadays was very bad, in attempting to prevent the independence of the Spanish colonies, as also in wishing to declare war against these states. He has told me also that in the event of a declaration of war against Great Britain they will immediately place an army of 50,000 men in our country to aid our independence [movement] and make common cause with us. I thanked him in behalf of our nation and requested him that what he said to me verbally they should do me the favor to give me in writing; he said that he would consult with the personages of the highest rank and give me a reply. He also told me that I should take comfort in having the great merit of being the man who had come to open a road which was closed to us but which upon my coming was become very broad and passable. What has especially impressed el Gobernador Alonso de León desde Cuahuila hasta hallar cerca del Lago de San Bernardo el lugar donde havian poblado los Franceses"; and on the map the name "Lago de San Bernardo" is the only name applied to the bay. See "De Leon's Expedition of 1689" in the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, map opposite p. 199, and pp. 219-220, note 2. Though the name Bahía del Espíritu Santo is the name most frequently associated with this bay in its early history, the first Texas port, at the mouth of the Colorado River, authorized by royal decree of Sept. 28, 1805, was named San Bernardo. See Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, II. 2; Hatcher, p. 358.

<sup>62</sup> Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara tells of a family tradition that his great-grandfather learned to swear in English under the stress of his difficulties with the men in power at Washington!

<sup>63</sup> James Monroe, Secretary of State 1811-1817.

<sup>64</sup> Joel Barlow, Jonathan Russell (*chargé d'affaires*), George W. Erving. Monroe's instruction to Barlow, Nov. 27, 1811, is printed in Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States concerning the Independence of the Latin-American Nations*, I. 12. Identical instructions were, Dr. Manning says, sent to the United States ministers to Great Britain, Denmark, and Russia.

them is that I have come by land, almost alone the greater part of the way and entirely alone about 300 leagues.

Today word was sent from the Secretary's office to Mr. Davis,<sup>65</sup> owner of the house where I am, that he should give me a room fitted with everything necessary for my perfect comfort, and that if it were unpleasant for me to go down to eat at the common table, my meals should be served in my own room.<sup>66</sup>

18. I did not leave my room because of the bitter cold, which froze nearly all the water in the harbor channel.

19. I went to the office of the Secretary of State and was [with him] an hour. I went back to the boarding-house; and a little afterward the deputy of Caracas and his companion came to see me; they made me many offers.

20. I did not leave the house.

21. I went out to see the deputy from Caracas, and from there I went to the office of the Secretary of State.

22. [Sunday]. I walked to the Arsenal where they are making gun-boats, launches, and other vessels. Three large frigates of 36 to 48 cannon were in the harbor (*estaban abordo*). It is worth seeing—such admirable machines, some operated by steam (*fuego*), others in other ways. This is where they make the iron-work of the ships. I must come back to examine these machines in order to understand them somewhat. I wondered at seeing such great cannon and mortars. There are many 48-pound cannon; on the shore are some heaps of shells and cannon balls which look like houses. There is also a pyramid of marble<sup>67</sup> which they ordered made in Italy in honor and memory of the Americans who died in Tripoli in the battle which they fought with the Turks. On this the battle is admirably sculptured. It has a statue in the form of a beautiful woman with a gilded pen in her hand, which represents history, another which represents America, and others which represent I know not what. I saw also the statue of Neptune in the form of a very ferocious giant, and another statue of the same size, of an Indian.

23. I went to see the great assemblage of Congress in the great and marvelous Capitol. I heard their great debates on determining finally the sixth and last point regarding the war which they expect with Great Britain. This last resolves itself into the question whether it is expedient to raise an army of 50,000 men; but today it has not yet been finally determined.<sup>68</sup> In the night an unfortunate thing happened to me in connec-

<sup>65</sup> John Davis, proprietor of the Indian Queen Hotel, on Pennsylvania Avenue near Sixth Street, then the chief hostelry in Washington.

<sup>66</sup> At the secretary's expense, says Garza. *Dos Hermanos Héroes*, p. 30.

<sup>67</sup> This monument to the sailors lost in the Tripolitan War, 1801-1805, was "made at the expense of officers of the navy"; was "brought from Italy to the navy-yard in the *Constitution*", and erected in 1808. It was moved from the Navy Yard to the west terrace of the Capitol in 1831. "By 1860 it was . . . sent [to] Annapolis, where it stands in the grounds of the Academy . . ." See Helen Nicolay, *Our Capital on the Potomac* (New York, 1914), p. 481; W. B. Bryan, *A History of the National Capital* (*ibid.*, 1914), II. 328; Louise B. Latimer, *Your Washington and Mine* (*ibid.*, 1924), p. 114. These citations were furnished me by the Library of Congress.

<sup>68</sup> The bill to raise an additional military force, passed by the Senate on Dec. 20, was read twice in the House the same day, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it was not reported by that committee until Dec. 27, and the *Annals* report no House debate on it till Dec. 31.

tion with a doctor of physic, and two other gentlemen. In the Gazette which came today from Philadelphia there appeared two paragraphs in Spanish which I can do no less than copy here. They run as follows:

"*Mr. Editor.* My dear Sir: The letter which I addressed to you and which you were good enough to insert yesterday in your newspaper has been collated by persons who know English as perfectly as Spanish, and I have noted that the person entrusted with the translation has [not] done it faithfully, so that the sense varies somewhat [from the original]. Therefore will you have the goodness to insert the original in Spanish? This favor will greatly please your obedient servant,

JOSÉ ÁLVAREZ DE TOLEDO.<sup>69</sup>

"*Mr. Editor:*

My coming from Spain to this country, in connection with my having abandoned the National Congress, of which I was a member, a representative of the city of Santo Domingo, has set the curious and much more the agents and spies of the Spanish government in this place to thinking. I wish to lay the doubts of the one and the other; and, considering that for this purpose it will be sufficient to publish the official letter which I wrote to the Cabildo of Santo Domingo as soon as I arrived in this city, I enclose an exact copy of it, and I beg of you to do me the courtesy to insert it with this letter in your liberal newspaper; calling attention to the fact that those who desire to know the details more thoroughly and circumstantially can read the manifesto which I have just published,<sup>70</sup> and which will be found on sale at the bookshop of Bradford and Inskeep, no. 4, South Third Street. Meanwhile I assure everybody that with all my heart I love the good European Spaniards, I detest the wicked ones, and above all the tyrants; that I am moved by the fate of Spain; and that I suffer with her in her mortal agony, oppressed by her foreign enemies and assassinated by that atrocious and barbarous Cádiz government, which ceases not to hasten her utter ruin. Above all, I desire the liberty and absolute independence of all the continent and islands of the hemisphere of Colon; I am an American, and I shall with joy pour out my blood to contribute to this happy and glorious regeneration. These are the sentiments of my soul, and the great ideas which fill my imagination. I am your humble and obedient servant, JOSÉ ÁLVAREZ DE TOLEDO."

24. I went to the house of Don Telésforo de Orea, deputy of Caracas, and took him the letter of O'Farril?; and it pleased him greatly. From there I went to the Secretary's office to show it to the chief clerk, who asked me to give it to him; and I gave it to him. I came home, and my aforesaid doctor had a carriage to drive out to the village of Georgetown (*Jorre*) which is a little more than a league from here; we went, and found it a pretty village. At night we returned home; we had supper. My grand doctor and other gentlemen asked me to get into the carriage and accompany them to the house of one of them; I did not go there, however, because they took me to another place where I saw things which in all my life I had never seen before. O what formidable mirrors there are

<sup>69</sup> See note 10, above, and I. J. Cox, *loc. cit.*

<sup>70</sup> José Álvarez de Toledo, *Manifiesto á Satisfaccion Pundonorosa, á todos los buenos Españolas Europeos, y á todos los Pueblos de la America, por un Diputado de los Cortes reunidas en Cádiz* [Philadelphia, 1811] (copy in Library of Congress). The official letter to the cabildo of Santo Domingo (Oct. 2, 1811), mentioned above, is printed as an appendix to this pamphlet.

here in which to see the monstrosity of the world! Note: The Doctor was also a contemptible runt.

25. Today at 12 Doctor Mitchill<sup>71</sup> called (*tube de visita al Doctor Miche*). He is a celebrated chemist; those who know him say that there is not his equal in this country. At night I went to the house of a Parisian French lady and gentleman who spoke Spanish.

26. In the morning there came to my room a German gentleman, who told me that Congress had decreed that all this nation should be in favor of the Republic (*Republica del Reyno*) of Mexico; and that as soon as the latter makes it apparent that it has a settled government and declares its independence it will immediately be recognized as a free nation; as will also Caracas and the other provinces that declare themselves independent. A little while ago came Dr. José García de Cádiz, a Creole of Caracas, resident in Philadelphia; and he told me that Congress has resolved to raise 25,000 active troops and to mobilize all the militia, which amounts to 900,000 men.

27. I went to the Secretary's office; I stayed an hour and came home. A little while ago a troop of fifty Freemasons passed along the street, each one with the regalia (*divisa*) appropriate to his grade; they marched two and two, to the music of a military band. Today I have been rejoicing because Señor Álvarez de Toledo has come from Philadelphia; he is a man of great talents, and passionately devoted to the cause of the liberty of Mexico; up to the present time he has worked much to this end; his merit therein is great and [he is] worthy of recompense and advancement in the cause, at the hands of that nation. The discourses of this gentleman are admirably great and just.<sup>72</sup>

28. Today I went to the office of the Secretary of State (*Cecretaria del Despacho*); I gave a letter to the chief clerk to put into the hands of His Excellency; and he told me that reply would be made to me within two days. He also told me the sad news that in a place near here the theatre had burned and that the Governor, his daughter, and many [other] persons had been burned.<sup>73</sup>

29. I did not leave the house; Licentiate Revengos<sup>74</sup> called.

30. I went to the Secretary's office, but I could not speak with His Excellency, because of the important business before his ministry. Today Mr. Foster, minister of Great Britain, dropped in; in the afternoon Señor Álvarez and I walked to the House of Congress, Senate, and Judiciary, merely to admire the fine architectural style of that edifice. Even the foreigners who have seen the kingdoms of Europe admire greatly these grand works of this Capitol.

<sup>71</sup> Samuel Latham Mitchill (1764-1831), "the Nestor of American science", who at the time of Gutiérrez's stay in Washington was a member of Congress, a representative from New York.

<sup>72</sup> In contrast with this high praise, the *Report* has not a good word to say for Toledo. See *Lamar Papers*, I. 17 et seq. See also *Dos Hermanos Héroes*, pp. 53, 66 et seq.

<sup>73</sup> The burning of the Richmond Theatre, on the night of Dec. 26, 1811. See H. Howe, *Historical Collections of Virginia* (Charleston, S. C., 1845), pp. 309-311.

<sup>74</sup> I.e., probably José Rafael Revenga (1781-1852), a Venezuelan patriot, who at this time seems to have been an envoy to Washington in behalf of the revolution in his own country. See the sketch in *Encyclopedie Universal*.

31. I went to the Secretary's office; and Mr. Graham<sup>75</sup> lent me 200 pesos expense money, as appears from a note which I left signed today. He also gave me a letter to the governor of Louisiana,<sup>76</sup> asking him to furnish me everything I needed for my transportation. All have been amazed at the very great favors which this government has done me. I was three hours in the Secretary's office because a certain negotiation was being concluded with the secretary of Napoleon's minister. He is a lad (*mosito*) of about twenty years, and has a very charming presence.<sup>77</sup>

(To be continued.)

*2. Papers relating to Belligerent and Neutral Rights, 1861-1865.*

THE following documents from the Admiralty Papers in the Public Record Office at London, the Archives de la Marine at Paris, and the State Department archives in Washington, have been selected from a collection of photostats and transcripts of unpublished materials concerning the American Civil War, made with the aid of a grant from the Bureau of International Research of Harvard University and Radcliffe College. More extended comment on these materials may be found in the writer's article, "The British Government and Neutral Rights, 1861 to 1865", in this issue of the *Review*. Permission to use the opinions of the law officers of the crown was obtained through the kind intervention of William Perrin, Esq., O.B.E., the librarian of the Admiralty.

JAMES P. BAXTER, 3RD.

I. ADMIRAL MILNE'S INSTRUCTIONS OF MAY 30, 1861.

NILE, AT HALIFAX, 30 May, 1861

Confidential Instructions for the guidance of Cruizers employed on the Coasts of America in the protection of British Commerce.<sup>1</sup>

HER Majesty having, through Her Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, signified Her Pleasure that, in the Civil War raging in America, Her Naval Forces are not to indicate any partiality or preference for either party, It will be your duty to exercise the strictest neutrality between the Contending parties (both of whom are recognised by H.M.'s Government as invested with Belligerent Rights) and with this view you will, while preserving a firm but conciliatory demeanour, abstain in any intercourse you may have with [officers or]<sup>2</sup> Citizens of the United or the

<sup>75</sup> See note 53. The use of the money is referred to in a letter of Gutiérrez to Graham, Philadelphia, Jan. 17, 1812. State Department, Miscellaneous Letters.

<sup>76</sup> William Charles Cole Claiborne, governor of the Mississippi Territory 1801-1804, of the territory of Orleans 1804-1812, of the state of Louisiana 1812-1816.

<sup>77</sup> Count Georges de Caraman. In 1853 he contributed to the *Revue Contemporaine*, III. 208-234, an article giving his recollections of diplomatic life in Washington, "Les Etats-Unis il y a Quarante Ans".

<sup>1</sup> Admiralty 1/5759. P. 237.

<sup>2</sup> The two words in brackets were, at the suggestion of the Queen's advocate, Sir John Harding, added by order of the Admiralty in revised instructions which

Confederated States not only from acting, but from expressing sentiments contrary to Her Majesty's Pleasure and you will enjoin the same line of conduct upon all under your orders.

#### ARTICLE 2.

While however it is your duty to observe the strictest neutrality between the Contending Parties, it is equally an imperative duty to afford the greatest possible protection to lawful British Commerce, which will be affected on the one hand by the Blockades about to be, or which may have been *de facto* established by the Northern States, and on the other by the Letters of Marque which are being issued by the Southern confederation.

#### ARTICLE 3—BLOCKADES.

The President of the United States, by his Proclamation of the 19th Ultimo, declared his intention of Blockading the Ports of the States of S. Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and by his Proclamation of the 28th of that month also of those of Virginia and North Carolina, of which the Blockades have been actually announced by Commodore Prendergast, Commanding the United States Squadron who states that he has sufficient force at his disposal to maintain them effectively.

If such Blockades are effectively established and maintained, it will be your duty to respect them, but even should the force employed be, in your opinion, insufficient to render the Blockade effective, you will content yourself with representing your views to the Commander of the Blockading Squadron [in courteous but precise terms and with full particulars in writing and forthwith report to me the full particulars, sending me copies of all communications between you and such Commander, and also sending to the Admiralty copies of such reports and communications, by the earliest opportunity.]<sup>3</sup> so that any British Sufferers, whose right to claim redress might eventually be recognized by H.M. Government, may have the benefit of reference to your reclamations made on the spot.<sup>4</sup> Should your advice, in respect to such Blockades, be asked for by any British Ships you might happen to fall in with, it would, while referring to the Milne issued in August, 1861. Admiralty 1/5767, Harding to Russell, June 13; Hammond to the Admiralty, June 14; Adm. 13/30, Romaine to Milne, June 15; Adm. 1/5759. P. 239, Milne to Admiralty, June 26; *ibid.*, P. 395, Milne to Admiralty, Aug. 8.

<sup>3</sup> At the suggestion of the Queen's advocate, and by order of the Admiralty, Milne added the words enclosed in brackets when he revised his instructions in August, 1861.

<sup>4</sup> See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 8, Papers relating to the Blockade of the Ports of the Confederate States", for the acts of British cruisers under these instructions. On Oct. 5 and Nov. 5, 1861, Hammond informed the Admiralty that Russell, "after communication with the Proper Law Adviser of the Crown . . . is of opinion that such communications [to commanders of blockading squadrons] are unnecessary, and may possibly be attended with evil effects", and asked that Milne be so informed. As Milne then revised his instructions, American commanders were spared the perusal of many British reports concerning inadequacies of the blockade. Adm. 1/5768, Hammond to the Admiralty, Oct. 5, Nov. 5, 1861. The revised instructions of Nov. 12, 1861, are in Adm. 1/5872. P. 269.

enclosed Queen's Proclamation of the 13th Instant, which is sent herewith for your guidance, be prudent on your part simply to state that such and such places are known to be Blockaded effectively and that H.M.'s Government had recognized each party as a Belligerent and consequently entitled to all the rights of War as against Neutrals—avoiding as much as possible all technical points of international law upon which you, as an observer, are not called upon to act or decide, but which, if open to objection, would, in the ordinary course of events be subsequently adjusted by the respective Governments.

ARTICLE 4—PRIVATEERS.

The President of the Confederate States has, on the other hand, by his Proclamation of the 17th Ultimo offered Letters of Marque to private Armed Ships, which there is reason to believe will lead to the fitting out of many privateers, and as from the unscrupulousness with which privateering is generally conducted, British Commerce may suffer severely from lawless depredations, you will adopt every possible lawful measure to protect British ships from molestation by such Privateers—not hesitating, in a clear case of Piracy on *British* Ships to deal with the Aggressor as a Pirate, in accordance with the Instructions issued by the L.C.A. [Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty] on the 8th June 1818 . . . [annexed].<sup>5</sup>

ARTICLE 5.

It will be expedient that you should approach for observation and, if necessary, communication with the Blockading Squadrons, within the limits assigned to you, but unless protection to British Life should absolutely demand it, you are to avoid entering into any Ports in the occupation of Confederate Authorities or Troops, as the visit of any of H.M.'s Ships might probably be interpreted into a disposition on the part of H.M.'s Government to give countenance and support to the secession movement, and consequently any step calculated to convey such an impression is to be avoided. Their Lordships letters of the 1 March, M. No. 122 [124], and of the 18th May, M. No. 250, and their Enclosures, by which you will be strictly guided will put you in possession of the views of H.M. Government in respect to Vessels flying the Palmetto or other secessionist Flag.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Harding reported to Russell, June 13, that: "With respect to Article 4, I can only say that it is a question of policy (and not of Law) whether there is at present so much reason to anticipate the perpetration of piratical outrages by the Confederate Privateers against British Vessels and goods, as to require the issuing of such strong and peremptory orders. In the case referred to by the Admiral (June 18, 1818, South America) it appears that 'divers piratical acts and outrages' had been actually committed against British vessels and goods." Russell, however, thought that it was "quite right to anticipate piratical acts and outrages, and to put them down, if they should occur, with a strong hand". Adm. 1/5767, Hammond to Admiralty, June 14, 1861; Adm. 13/30, Romaine to Milne, June 15, 1861. The instructions of June 8, 1818, are printed in *British and Foreign State Papers*, V. 963.

<sup>6</sup> The Admiralty order of Mar. 1 "with regard to the course to be pursued by Officers commanding H.M. Ships in the treatment of vessels engaged in Slave Trade and which sail really or ostensibly under the Flag of one or more of the States which have seceded from the Federation of the U.S. of N. America", com-

**ARTICLE 6.**

You are to understand that although the Civil War in America confers Belligerent rights on both of the Contending parties yet that the position of Great Britain remains unaltered and consequently the Instructions you have received, prohibiting the visit or search of United States (or Secessionist) Merchant Ships are not affected thereby. In the event however of falling in with a British Merchant Vessel, which you may have reason to suppose had not intentionally disregarded H.M.'s Proclamation of the 13th Instant above referred to and which may have been detained by a Vessel carrying a letter of Marque, you would be quite justified in ascertaining the authority for as well as the cause of such detention.

**ARTICLE 7.**

You will furnish me with the usual monthly Return of all Foreign Vessels met with, including therein full particulars of all privateers and other suspicious vessels, and especially of all Blockading Squadrons fallen in with and of which you will be careful to give the numbers, force, etc. as well as to state your opinion as to whether they are, in each case, adequate to maintain efficiently the Blockade upon which they may be engaged.

**ARTICLE 8.**

Great caution is to be exercised in approaching the American Coast, many of the Lights being already removed, and it is not improbable but that others may be dealt with in a like manner.

**ARTICLE 9.**

With reference to the expressed intention of the U. States to deal with Secessionist Privateers as Pirates,—the following opinion has been given thereon by H.M.'s Advocate General in respect to British Subjects captured in, and serving in such privateers.—

"With respect to the concluding Paragraph of the Proclamation [Lincoln's of April 19, 1861], relating to the treatment of Secession Privateers as Pirates—I do not consider it necessary at present to enter fully into its consideration

"I will merely observe that Pirates 'jure gentium' are 'hostes omnium' common robbers upon the seas having a general and indiscriminate 'animus depredante' ['di' in margin] against all persons in general which cannot be properly predicated of rebels or insurgents acting under manded Milne to "direct the commanding officers of Vessels employed under your orders for the suppression of S.T. on meeting a vessel hoisting one of the above mentioned flags to treat such Vessel precisely as they would treat a Vessel of the U.S. and not to board or call for papers unless they have sufficient reason to doubt the nationality of the Vessel or her right to the protection of any Flag". On May 18 the Admiralty ordered Milne to conform his actions in repressing the slave trade to an opinion from the law officers of the crown stating: "that the co-operation of commanders of H.M. Cruizers should not be continued, because of the great danger of its ending in some act of hostility against some Vessel of the Southern Confederacy and consequently in a breach of Neutrality—also that the notice of the presence of suspected Vessels carrying the Flag of the Southern confederation ought not to be conveyed to the cruisers of the United States as such notice would be inconsistent with the duties of neutrality." Adm. 13/30. See Ashley, *Palmerston*, II. 227; and Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, pp. 132-145.

'Letters of Marque' from a 'de facto' Sovereign and independent Govt only seeking to capture the property of the subjects or citizens of the particular Government to which they are themselves hostile; and above all carrying their prizes into Port for legal adjudication. H.M. Government is not concerned as to the treatment which President Lincoln may choose to inflict upon any Persons captured in Privateers who may not be British Subjects, but British Subjects, who are only hostile privateersmen, cannot rightfully, when captured as such on the high seas be treated as Pirates '*jure gentium*' by President Lincoln. The laws of the U.S. (to which he alludes) cannot rightfully make a British Subject guilty of Piracy on the high seas, merely for serving in a hostile Privateer."<sup>7</sup>

II. ADMIRAL MILNE'S ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS OF JUNE 20, 1861.

*Confidential*

*NILE, AT HALIFAX, 20 June, 1861*

Additional Instructions for the guidance of Cruizers employed in the protection of British Commerce on the West [East] Coast of North America.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In the revised instructions of Aug. 8 and Nov. 12, 1861, the order of Articles 8 and 9 is reversed, and there are some changes in capitalization and punctuation. Harding reported to Russell, June 13, that "with respect to Article 9, it is for H.M.'s Govt. to consider whether it is practically prepared fully to adopt, and embody in the Admiral's orders, the legal observations which I have felt it my duty to offer . . . on the Proclamation of President Lincoln; if so, it may possibly be considered proper to give President Lincoln notice to this effect . . .". Russell, however, did "not think it necessary to give any notice to President Lincoln of the view taken by H.M.'s Govt. of the conduct of a British subject serving in a Privateer of the Confederate States. The case may not arise, and at all events President Lincoln knows very well the distinction that H.M.'s Govt. have made between Belligerents and Pirates, and does not need to be reminded of it. In some cases indeed H.M.'s Govt. might be reluctant to interfere with the Govt. of the United States in behalf of a freebooting British Subject". Russell advised that Milne "either recall that passage of his instructions or add a supplementary passage to guard against any mischief which might result if that opinion should transpire" (Adm. 1/5767, Hammond to the Admiralty, June 14; Adm. 13/30, Romaine to Milne, June 15). Milne replied on Aug. 8 that "the whole of the Instructions were and are issued confidentially and I have further cautioned Commodore Dunlop and other Officers to take the greatest care that the opinion given by the Queen's advocate should not transpire" (Adm. 1/5759. P. 395). He pointed out, moreover, that if he had "given no directions to the Cruizers on this important point, and had the case arisen of a bona fide British Subject being hanged as a Pirate for serving in a Southern Privateer, in the actual presence of a British Commander, who acting literally on the Queen's Proclamation had felt that he had no option but to abandon his fellow countryman to his fate, I am free to confess I could not, with the Queen's Advocate's opinion furnished for my *guidance*, have acquitted myself of blame in not anticipating the occurrence of the case in my Instructions to such British Officer . . .". Adm. 1/5759. P. 239, Milne to Admiralty, June 26. See also Hansard, third ser., CLXII, 1829-1834, 2082-2086.

<sup>8</sup> Adm. 1/5759. P. 238. On May 1, Milne had asked the Admiralty for instructions on five points, "in case privateering is really resorted to on an extensive scale". *Ibid.*, no. 183. These additional instructions which he issued on June 20, were based on the Admiralty's reply of June 1, transmitting answers to Milne's questions given by Russell after consultation with the proper law adviser

## ARTICLE 1.

Any Merchant Ship fallen in with flying the Flag of the Confederate States, is to be treated *in all respects the same* as those under the United States Flag.

## ARTICLE 2.

Conjoint cruizing of United States and Her Majesty's Ships of War in the suppression of the Slave Trade is no longer to be carried on, as it might lead to an infringement of the strict neutrality that is to be observed.<sup>9</sup>

## ARTICLE 3.

H.M. Government having with a view to carrying out more effectually the principle of neutrality interdicted the Armed Ships, as well as the Privateers of both Parties from carrying Prizes made by them into the Ports, Harbours, Roadsteads or waters of the United Kingdom, or of any of Her Majesty's Colonies or Possessions abroad—You are to govern yourself accordingly, understanding however that this restriction applies to Prizes seeking protection from an Enemy or sent to Ports to await adjudication, and not to Vessels putting into British Ports from stress of weather, or being otherwise in distress.<sup>10</sup>

## ARTICLE 4.

As neither of the two Contending Parties have as yet acceded to the Paris Convention of 1856 (See Hertsletts Treaties vol. 10 Page 547) with respect to free Ships making free goods and goods of Neutrals not being seizable in enemies Ships, the Rules laid down in that declaration will not be applicable to British Vessels and Goods.<sup>11</sup>

## ARTICLE 5.

The right of visit and search is regarded by H.M. Government as a right appertaining to the lawfully commissioned Cruizers of Belligerents, of the crown. Adm. 13/30, Romaine to Milne, June 1; Adm. 1/5767, Hammond to the Admiralty, June 1. These additional instructions were reissued by Milne, Nov. 12, 1861, with some changes in punctuation and capitalization. Adm. 1/5872, P. 269.

<sup>9</sup> See the note to article 5 of the instructions of May 30, *supra*.

<sup>10</sup> The British interdict of June 1 on the entry of prizes is printed in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 1", p. 38. In transmitting his instructions of June 20 to the Admiralty, Milne observed that "I have slightly relaxed the rigid rule laid down so far as to admit them to shelter when in actual distress. Had I not made this proviso, a case of refusal under such circumstances might have justly brought upon us great National discredit, and I cannot but feel that in obeying the simple dictates of humanity, I am giving effect to what are the real views and intentions of Her Majesty's Government". Adm. 1/5759. P. 238, no. 253.

<sup>11</sup> This situation was of course altered when both the United States and the Confederate States regulated their conduct in harmony with portions of the Declaration of Paris. See the resolutions of the Confederate Congress of Aug. 13, 1861, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1862, vol. LXII., "North America, no. 3", p. 25; and Seward to Adams, Sept. 7, 1861, in *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs*, 1861, p. 127. See also E. D. Adams, *Great Britain and the American Civil War*, vol. I., ch. V.

when exercised by them, subject to and in conformity with the Modern Law and usage of Nations.

ARTICLE 6.

Excepting as to Arms, Ammunition and Military Stores (which are clearly Contraband of War by the Common Law and usage of Nations) it must be left to the Government and Prize Courts of the Belligerents in the exercise of a reasonable discretion to define what articles will be considered and treated by them as Contraband of War.

III. ADMIRAL MILNE'S SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS OF NOVEMBER 12,  
1861.

NILE, AT HALIFAX, 12th November, 1861

Supplemental Instructions for Cruisers employed on the Coast of America.<sup>12</sup>

ARTICLE A.

The U.S. Government have decided that the Law of Blockade does not permit a Vessel in a Blockaded Port to take on board Cargo after the commencement of the Blockade.<sup>13</sup>

ARTICLE B.

H.M. Consuls in Blockaded Ports are instructed to represent the cases of British Vessels which they may consider to be illegally debarred from egress from such Ports to the U.S. Blockading Squadrons, and if they fail in obtaining redress, they are then to represent the matter to H.M. Government and to H.M. Minister at Washington; no Naval Officer is therefore to interfere in such matters without express authority, except by giving friendly advice and exercising generally his good offices.

ARTICLE C.

It is H.M.'s Command that all her Officers abstain from any act likely to involve Great Britain in hostilities with the United States.<sup>14</sup>

ARTICLE D.

In any communications you may have occasion to hold with Officers of either of the Belligerent Powers, you are as a general rule to abstain from making known the particular nature of the orders you may be acting under.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Adm. 1/5759. P. 513.

<sup>13</sup> See J. B. Moore, *Digest*, VII. 849-851.

<sup>14</sup> Founded on a letter from Russell to the Admiralty, July 27, 1861. Adm. 1/5768.

<sup>15</sup> Milne's subordinate, Commodore Dunlop, had issued similar orders from H.M.S. *Spiteful*, Nassau, Aug. 1. "As it is most desirable to avoid by every possible means giving cause of irritation or jealousy to either of the belligerent Parties in the North American States, you are, in all communications you may have with American officers or others carefully to abstain from mentioning the nature of the orders under which you are acting, merely stating in general terms, that the duty assigned to you is the protection of British Interests." Adm. 1/5759. P. 374. See the note to article 9 of Milne's instructions of May 30, 1861, *supra*.

## ARTICLE E.

Written communications with the Officers commanding U.S. Cruisers in respect to Blockades found inefficient (see Article 3 of the Original Instructions) are no longer deemed necessary by H.M. Government and are therefore to be discontinued.<sup>16</sup>

IV. THE LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN ON THE CASE OF THE "TRENT",  
NOVEMBER 12, 1861.<sup>17</sup>

*Printed for the use of the Cabinet, November 29, 1861*

*Confidential.*

THE LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN TO EARL RUSSELL  
(Received November 12.)

DOCTORS' COMMONS, November 12, 1861

*My Lord,*

We were honoured with your Lordship's commands, signified in Mr. Hammond's letter of the 9th instant, stating that he was directed by your Lordship to request our immediate attention to the following case:—

"The Confederate States of North America have recently appointed two gentlemen, Messrs. Mason and Slidell, to proceed to Europe, accredited to the English and French Governments respectively.

"These gentlemen embarked on board the steamer 'Nashville', which vessel appears from accounts in the daily papers successfully to have run the blockade of Charleston, and to have conveyed the two gentlemen to Cardenas in Cuba.

"It appears also from accounts published in the daily papers that the Federal Government immediately on hearing of the escape of the 'Nashville' dispatched three vessels of war to intercept her.

"Within these few days a duly commissioned Federal steamer of war, mounting eight guns of heavy calibre, made her appearance at Falmouth, and she has since arrived at Southampton, where she has coaled, and is now ready for sea at a moment's notice.

"Private information has been received that the object of this vessel is to capture the two Envoys before they arrive in Europe.

"It is not improbable that Messrs. Mason and Slidell will have embarked at the Havana on board the West India mail-steamer now on her passage to Southampton.

"That steamer is one of those under contract with Her Majesty's Government for the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails, which mails are exclusively under the charge of a commissioned officer of Her Majesty's navy, acting on behalf of the Postmaster-General. In other respects the steamer is a mere merchant-steamer, and is not authorized to display a pennant as a ship of war.

"Assuming, therefore, that the United States' man-of-war steamer now lying at Southampton, or any other similar steamer of the United

<sup>16</sup> See the notes to article 3 of Milne's instructions of May 30, 1861, *supra*.

<sup>17</sup> Adm. 1/5768. Portions of this opinion and of the following opinion of Nov. 28 were contained in a letter of Edward Twistleton of London to William Dwight of Boston dated London, Dec. 7, 1861, an extract from which is preserved in vol. CXXXVI. of the Sumner MSS. in the Harvard College Library. That extract was printed in the Mass. Hist. Soc. *Proceedings*, XLVII. 107-109. Briefer extracts appeared in the *Works of Charles Sumner*, VI. 163-164.

States, should attempt to intercept the West Indian mail-steamer, with a view of getting possession of the persons of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, or of their credentials or instructions," your Lordship wished to be informed "to what extent, under the Law of Nations, a man-of-war steamer of the United States would be entitled to interfere with the mail-steamer if fallen in with beyond the territorial limits of the United Kingdom, that is, beyond three miles from the British coast.

"Whether, for instance, she might cause the West Indian mail-steamer to bring-to, might board her, examine her papers, open the mail-bags, and examine the contents thereof, examine the luggage of passengers, seize and carry away Messrs. Mason and Slidell in person, or seize their credentials, and instructions and despatches, or even put a prize crew on board the West Indian steamer, and carry her off to a port of the United States. In other words, what would be the rights of the American cruiser with regard to the passengers and crew, and lawful papers and correspondence on board our packet, on the assumption that the said packet was liable to capture and confiscation on the ground of carrying enemies' despatches: would the cruiser be entitled to carry the packet, and all and everything in her, back to America, or would she be obliged to land in this country, or in some near port, all the people and all the unseizable goods?"

Mr. Hammond was further to inquire "whether, supposing one of Her Majesty's ships of war should be sent to follow the movements of the United States' steamer of war, or should have been ordered to meet the West Indian steamer, and escort her into port, such ship of war of Her Majesty would be justified, and to what extent, in preventing the United States' steamer of war from interfering with the West Indian mail-steamer?"

In obedience to your Lordship's commands, we have the honour to report—

That your Lordship's first question may, in our opinion, be answered to the effect that the United States' man-of-war falling in with the British mail-steamer beyond the territorial limits of the United Kingdom might cause her to bring-to, might board her, examine her papers, open the general mail-bags, and examine the contents thereof, without, however opening any bag or packet addressed to any officer or Department of Her Majesty's Government.

The United States' ship of war may put a prize-crew on board the West India steamer, and carry her off to a port of the United States for adjudication by a Prize Court there; but she would have no right to remove Messrs. Mason and Slidell, and carry them off as prisoners, leaving the ship to pursue her voyage.<sup>18</sup>

On the assumption that the West India packet is liable to capture and confiscation, on the ground of carrying enemies' despatches, the cruiser would, in strictness, be entitled to carry her, and all and everything in her, to America. She might, however, and, in our opinion, ought, under the circumstances, to put on shore at some convenient port passengers and their baggage, not being contraband of war.

We cannot say that any of Her Majesty's ships of war would be justified in preventing the United States' man-of-war from interfering with the West India mail-steamer on the high seas. The case is not one of such a character as to justify resistance by force *in limine*, even as-

<sup>18</sup> See pp. 15-16, *supra*.

suming that the condemnation of the vessel would not be justified. The questions, whether any of the documents on board the mail-vessel are despatches contraband of war; and, if so, whether they are protected either by the nature of the conveyance, or by the character of the persons to whom they are addressed, or otherwise, are all questions which may admit of doubt and controversy, and do not appear to us to be concluded by authority; \* but we think that the decision of them, in the first instance at all events, belongs to the Prize Court of the captors.

We have, etc.

(Signed) J. D. HARDING.

WM. ATHERTON.

ROUNDELL PALMER.

\* See "The Atalanta", 6 C. Robinson's Admiralty Reports, 440; "The Caroline", *ibid.*, 461; Hautefeuille, "Des Droits et des Devoirs des Nations Neutres en Temps de Guerre Maritime," vol. ii, 462, 470; Wheaton's "Elements", sixth edition, p. 567 (Note A).

V. THE LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN ON THE CASE OF THE "TRENT",  
NOVEMBER 28, 1861.<sup>19</sup>

*Printed for the use of the Cabinet, November 28, 1861*

*Confidential*

THE LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN TO EARL RUSSELL

(Received November 28.)

DOCTORS' COMMONS, November 28, 1861

*My Lord,*

We were honoured with your Lordship's commands signified in Mr. Layard's letter of the 27th instant, stating that with reference to our Report of the 12th instant, giving our opinion upon certain questions put to us on the subject of the supposed intention of an United States' cruiser to intercept the West India mail-steamer with the view of getting possession of the persons of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, he was directed by your Lordship to transmit to us a letter from the Admiralty, inclosing a report from the Admiralty Agent on board the Royal mail-packet "Trent", of the circumstances under which Messrs. Mason and Slidell, together with their Secretaries, Messrs. McFarlane and Eustis, were forcibly taken, on the 8th instant, from out of that steamer by an armed force from the United States' screw-steamer "San Jacinto"; and to request that we would take this matter into our immediate consideration, and favour your Lordship with such observations as we might have to make thereupon.

In obedience to your Lordship's commands we have considered this matter, and have the honour to report—

That we are of opinion that the conduct of the United States' officer commanding the "San Jacinto", as set forth in Commander Williams' letter, was illegal and unjustifiable by international law.

The "San Jacinto" assumed to act as a belligerent, but the "Trent" was not captured or carried into a port of the United States for adjudication as prize, and, under the circumstances, cannot be considered as having acted in breach of international law.

It follows, that from on board a merchant-ship of a neutral Power, pursuing a lawful and innocent voyage, certain individuals have been

<sup>19</sup> Adm. 1/5782. Cf. *Letters of Queen Victoria*, ed. A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, III. 595. Palmerston to Queen Victoria, Nov. 29, 1861.

taken by force. They were not, apparently, officers in the military or naval service of the Confederate Government.

It does not appear that any papers whatsoever were demanded or taken by the captors, nor upon what charge or imputed offence, if any, the delivery of the prisoners was enforced. Her Majesty's Government will, therefore, in our opinion, be justified in requiring reparation for the international wrong which has been on this occasion committed.

We have, etc.

(Signed) J. D. HARDING  
WM. ATHERTON  
ROUNDELL PALMER

VI. SEWARD'S REPORT ON NEUTRAL MAILS, APRIL 24, 1863.<sup>20</sup>

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, 24th April, 1863

To the President.

. . . Belligerents and especially individuals interested in maritime captures under their authority, are naturally and almost inevitably disposed to take an extreme view of their supposed rights. If this be true in a war with a foreign nation, the disposition must of course be increased in a war like the present. The United States, however have heretofore been the assertors of neutral in opposition to belligerent rights as claimed by Great Britain. Even if this policy were not ascribable to a sense of national justice, it might be attributed to a consciousness that we are comparatively a young people, well aware of the advantages which our position gives us to avoid the many causes of war which in Europe are made inevitable by dynastic and other connexions between the powers of that quarter, and determined to avail ourselves of those advantages in the event of European wars. Furthermore our leaning to neutral rights may in part at least be occasioned by the circumstance that the preponderating interest in this country not directly engaged in Commerce, has hitherto been averse to maintain a navy in proportion to the mercantile marine or the general resources of the country. Though public sentiment upon this point may safely be assumed to have undergone material change of late years, that change cannot be allowed to be of so decided a character, as to warrant an assertion of belligerent rights as claimed by Great Britain, supposing her claim to be in the main founded upon the opinion that her overpowering naval force will enable her to make it good.

It is also obvious that any belligerent claim which we make during the existing war, will be urged against us as an unanswerable precedent when [we] may ourselves be at peace. It is true that at present Great Britain is the most extensive proprietor of Steam packets. The postal System of the United States, however, is even now largely carried on by similar means. In all probability it will soon be much extended. The inconvenience, vexation and loss, which must result from a liability to have the contents of public mails on board such Steamers examined in a prize Court, in the event of a foreign war are too obvious to require further exposition.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

<sup>20</sup> State Department Report Book No. 8, pp. 358-361. The writer will summarize the earlier portions of this document in an article in the *Am. Jour. of Internat. Law.*

VII. NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR ZÉDÉ'S REPORT, JUNE 2, 1863.<sup>21</sup>

PARIS le 2 Juin 1863

*Monsieur le Ministre,*

Mon nouveau service m'obligeant à de nombreux voyages en Angleterre, et m'y mettant en relations avec un certain nombre de constructeurs et d'armateurs, je me suis trouvé à même de bien connaître l'opinion de cette portion du public anglais sur les conséquences à tirer, pour l'avenir, des événements maritimes qui se sont produits en Amérique depuis le commencement des hostilités.

. . . Lors de mes premiers voyages, l'année dernière, j'avais pu remarquer comme tout le monde que l'intérêt, en Angleterre, était entièrement concentré sur les effets des navires cuirassés, que chacun suivait avec une vive attention, les événements auxquels ces bâtiments se trouvaient mêlés en Amérique, et recueillait avidement les moindres détails relatifs à leur construction et à leur installation. Puis, la conviction s'étant faite que nous seuls étions dans le vrai, et que les navires cuirassés seraient dorénavant les seuls navires de combat, éclatèrent les discussions si passionnées sur les formes à donner à ces bâtiments et sur la manière de les blinder.

Il y a quelques mois, j'avais déjà été frappé de voir que ce genre de questions, tout en restant la préoccupation exclusive de la marine militaire, ne semblait plus autant intéresser le monde commercial, et que l'attention de ce dernier commençait à se porter avec une sorte d'anxiété singulière sur les succès du Sumter et autres croiseurs confédérés. Enfin, lors de ce dernier voyage, j'ai été tout étonné de voir qu'il songeait à peine à s'inquiéter des causes de l'échec de la flotte des monitors devant Charleston, qu'il ne s'occupait guère de toutes les questions relatives aux bâtiments cuirassés que l'Amirauté fait construire, tandis qu'il suivait avec une joie peu dissimulée pour le présent, mais mélangée d'appréhensions pour l'avenir, les exploits de l'*Alabama* et ceux qu'il attendait de la *Virginia* qui vient de quitter la Clyde pour aller croiser dans les mers de l'Inde.

. . . Les navires anglais ne trouvent donc plus la concurrence américaine, qui était la seule sérieuse pour eux et accaparent tous les transports tandis que les navires fédéraux, qui ne peuvent plus lutter, désarment ou se vendent.

Cet état de choses explique un peu pourquoi nos voisins ne sont pas très pressés de voir se terminer la guerre américaine: ils regagnent par le commerce beaucoup plus qu'ils ne perdent maintenant par la disette de coton, il n'est donc pas étonnant, avec leur caractère, qu'ils ne fassent rien pour empêcher une situation si fructueuse de se prolonger le plus longtemps possible. Il explique aussi pourquoi le gouvernement n'a jamais fait et ne fera jamais d'efforts sérieux pour s'opposer à la construction sur le territoire Britannique, de navires de guerre pour les confédérés. La *Virginia* qui vient de partir, a été construite à Dumbarton, soi-disant pour l'empereur du Japon. J'ai pu voir près de Glasgow, un bâtiment cuirassé, qui va être lancé très prochainement, que le constructeur dit être destiné à l'empereur de la Chine, mais que chacun sait parfaitement être construit pour le compte du gouvernement confédéré.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Archives de la Marine, 6 DD<sup>1</sup> 88, dossier 2379.

<sup>22</sup> See *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies*, sec. ser., vol. II., using index, s.v., James and George Thomson and James H. North.

Mais si le commerce anglais exploite avec joie les bénéfices que lui procure l'augmentation du fret américain, il n'est pas sans préoccupation lorsqu'il refléchit que ce qui arrive aujourd'hui à ses anciens rivaux pourrait bien lui arriver aussi quelque jour à lui-même en cas de guerre maritime. Il a suffi, en effet, d'un seul croiseur, l'*Alabama*, pour produire ce résultat immense de faire changer de mains une grande partie du commerce maritime; ils comprennent fort bien que cette leçon ne sera perdue pour personne; aussi les Anglais, avec lesquels j'ai pu m'entretenir de cette question, paraissent-ils tous assez contrariés lorsqu'on leur fait envisager ce point de vue. La position n'est plus la même, en effet qu'il y a cinquante ans; le pavillon étranger n'est plus soumis à aucune surtaxe dans les ports britanniques: en cas de guerre avec nous, la marine marchande américaine, bien autrement puissance [puissante?] qu'alors, est là, toute prête à prendre sa revanche, et à accaparer le commerce dès que nos croiseurs auraient fait éléver le prix de l'assurance, et par suite du fret anglais. Il n'est donc pas surprenant que cette portion du public dont toute la fortune serait ainsi compromise, n'attache plus la même importance aux bâtiments cuirassés qui ne pourraient, du moins immédiatement, l'empêcher de se trouver ainsi ruinée. . . .

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'expression de mon profond respect.

L'ingénieur de la marine chargé de contrôle des paquebots transatlantiques

[Signé] Zédé.

VIII. OPINION OF THE LAW OFFICERS ON THE CASE OF THE  
"RAPPAHANNOCK".<sup>23</sup>

THE LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN TO EARL RUSSELL  
(Received December 10.)

LINCOLN'S INN, December 10, 1863.

My Lord,

We are honoured with your Lordship's commands signified in Mr. Hammond's letter of the 5th instant, stating that he was directed by your Lordship to transmit to us the accompanying papers, as marked in the inclosed list, respecting the case of the ship "Rappahannock", formerly under the name of the "Victor", one of the vessels of Her Majesty's Navy, which has recently been sold out of the Government service, and has been conveyed out of the port of Sheerness under the circumstances stated in the inclosed correspondence, to be employed as a vessel of war in the service of the so-styled Confederate States; and Mr. Hammond was to request that we would take these papers into consideration, and furnish your Lordship with our opinion on the following points:—

1. In what terms Mr. Adams' letter of the 28th ultimo should be answered.
2. Whether, under the circumstances, Her Majesty's Government would be justified in watching for the "Rappahannock" as she leaves Calais, and seizing her in the Channel.
3. Whether they would be justified in seizing her if she entered a port in the United Kingdom, or in one of the British Colonies.
4. Whether they would be justified in prohibiting her entrance into a British port, home or colonial, and refusing to allow her to obtain supplies.

<sup>23</sup> Adm. 1/5852.

Mr Hammond was to add that your Lordship would be happy to be furnished with any other observations which he may see occasion to offer with regard to this vessel; and that your Lordship would be glad to receive our report on these matters as soon as possible, in order that if we should be of opinion that any steps can be taken by Her Majesty's Government, no time may be lost in proceeding with them.

In obedience to your Lordship's commands we have fully considered this case, and have the honour to report—

That it appears to us to be a case of the very gravest importance, and to call for prompt and vigorous measures on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

An affront, accompanied by fraud, has been inflicted upon the honour and dignity of Her Majesty by the conduct of persons professing to be the agents of the Confederate Government. To the accomplishment of this fraud, one of her Majesty's dockyards and some of the artizans employed in it have been subservient; and an attempt has been made, if not to kidnap some of these artizans, and others of Her Majesty's subjects, to seduce them from their allegiance and to engage them in a foreign service, contrary to the law of the land and the express prohibition of their Sovereign.

We are of opinion that in reply to Mr. Adams your Lordship should state:—

(1) That the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been and still is directed to the general circumstances of this case, and to the particular facts alleged in the depositions which Mr. Adams has forwarded to your Lordship, and that there is a firm determination on the part of Her Majesty's Government both to vindicate, with respect to the Confederate belligerent, the neutrality of Her Majesty, and also to put in force the laws of this country against any persons who may appear to have offended against them in this matter.

(2). We have further to say that without expressing a positive opinion that the gross and fraudulent violation of Her Majesty's neutrality which has been committed might not warrant, even without previous communication with the Confederate States, so extreme a measure as the watching for the "Rappahannock", and the seizing her after she has left French waters, in the Channel, we do not, after a most anxious consideration of all the circumstances, advise Her Majesty's Government to take this step. But we think that Her Majesty's Government ought, without delay, to send an agent to the Government of the Confederate States, with instructions to express the very serious light in which Her Majesty's Government view this transaction, and their confident expectation that the Confederate Government will hasten to disavow and censure this act of the persons professing to be or acting as their agents in this country; and that Her Majesty's Government must require as a just reparation for the affront offered to the dignity of the Crown, for the flagrant abuse of the hospitality, and deliberate infringement of the neutrality of British territory, that the "Rappahannock" be given up to Her Majesty, upon receipt of the money which was paid for her to Her Majesty's Government.

That having made this demand Her Majesty's Representative should be instructed to wait for the answer of the Confederate Government, and in the event of the answer conveying the refusal of that Government to comply with this demand, to signify that he has received Her Majesty's directions to the following effect, namely (3 and 4), to inform the Confederate Government that Her Majesty's Government will give orders

that neither the "Rappahannock", nor the "Alabama", nor any other vessel which, after being fitted out with any kind of equipment in this country, has proceeded, when at sea, to hoist the Confederate flag, shall be allowed to enter any port or harbour of Her Majesty's dominions in any part of the world, and that if they do enter they shall be seized by Her Majesty's naval and military forces, and held in custody until Her Majesty's pleasure be taken with respect to them; and to apprise distinctly the Confederate Government that if, hereafter, any vessel shall repeat the offence of the "Rappahannock", Her Majesty will deem herself compelled to vindicate the dignity of her Crown, and the neutrality of her realm, by issuing orders to Her Majesty's ships to pursue and capture such vessel upon the high seas.

It will be understood that we think Her Majesty's Government will be warranted in doing that which is suggested by the fourth query in Mr Hammond's letter, in the event of satisfaction being refused by the Confederate States.

We are much inclined to think that Messrs. Gordon and Coleman ought to be indicted, but we cannot express a positive opinion upon this point until we have received and considered further evidence with respect to it.

We have, etc.

(Signed) ROUNDELL PALMER.  
R. P. COLLIER.  
ROBERT PHILLIMORE.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Histoire et Historiens depuis Cinquante Ans.* [Bibliothèque de la *Revue Historique*.] Two volumes. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1927. Pp. xii, 1-472, 473-758. 100 fr.)

THE *Revue Historique* was founded in 1876. For fifty years it has been possibly the best of general historical journals, probably the most useful, certainly the one that has most steadily maintained close relations, through chosen correspondents, with the progress of history in other countries than its own. It is characteristic of the *Revue's* ecumenical outlook that it has chosen to commemorate the conclusion of its fifty years of distinguished service by presenting a survey of historical progress made during that period in every land—progress in methods, in organization, and in results. The survey is confided in the case of most lands to a notable scholar of the country, in others to some Frenchman who, like the directors of the French institutes of research in foreign lands, has had peculiarly good opportunities to note what historians have been doing in the given country. The surveys in the first volume cover twenty-four European countries. In the second, there are reports respecting Latin America, Canada (by Dr. H. P. Biggar), the United States (by the late Professor Pasquet), China, and Japan, and special surveys, of much value and interest, of general progress in the history of the ancient Orient, Egypt, India, ancient Greece and Rome, the Byzantine Empire, post-Biblical Judaism, the papacy, and Islam; and Mr. W. G. Leland ends the volume with an account of international organization, which he has done so much to promote, in the field of historical studies.

Each of the chapters has, as French courtesy would probably suggest, approximately the same length (about twenty pages). Naturally this imposes a more summary treatment in the case of countries having abundant productivity in history than in the case of countries smaller or less advanced, but the latter are the countries respecting whose historical progress it has been least easy to keep one's self well informed from year to year. Some of the surveys are so compressed as to present little more than bibliographies, though bibliographies made useful by comment. In others the writer, by mentioning fewer books, has allowed himself room enough for instructive and interesting exposition of trends and developments and their causes. Those of Professor Halphen for France, Pirenne for Belgium, Marczali for Hungary, and Šusta for Czechoslovakia, are particularly suggestive.

A book which gives the titles of five or six thousand other books is naturally not one for continuous reading, but there is not an American

professor who would not profit by reading some portions of it. In the chapter on the country or field of history to which he is most devoted, he would be extraordinarily well informed if he did not find mention of books or developments that had escaped his notice. In other fields the book might serve him as a substitute of a sort, while he waits for Professor Dutcher's (or the American Historical Association's) *Guide to Historical Literature*. The chapters on the new countries will improve his appreciation of the spiritual changes resulting from the World War. Those on the more advanced small nations, from whom we have so much to learn, will enlarge his horizon, and perhaps teach him the need, for his own proper culture, of more languages than merely English, French, and German.

As the American reader reflects upon what has been done in fifty years for the advancement of history in Europe, he will very likely acquire a sharpened sense of the deficiencies which have marked that progress in the United States, although, in itself considered, the advance from the conditions of 1876 to those of 1926 has been greater on this side of the water than in Europe. He will deeply regret the shameful indifference of the federal government to the duty of providing such volumes of documentary historical material as even the poorer of the European governments have poured forth with profusion. He will lament that American scholars have interested themselves so little in other periods than those of the Reformation, the French Revolution, and the World War, in the history of other countries than England and France, or in economic and social history, or the history of art. He will note our relative neglect of religious history, especially in respect of the publication of sources for that of America. While the Catholics and the Jews pursue their religious history with ardor, the historical societies of the Protestant sects are only half alive, and rich theological seminaries give not a thought to the unpublished documents of their denominational history. On the other hand, the reflective reader of such a book will remember with pleasure the advantage he has in a land in which a hundred and twenty millions can dwell together without barriers or strife, and in which native gifts for organization can produce co-operation and unity of effort to an extent impossible elsewhere.

J. F. JAMESON.

*La Préhistoire Orientale*. Par JACQUES DE MORGAN, publié par LOUIS GERMAIN. Trois tomes. (Paris: Geuthner. 1925-1927. Pp. xxxv, 334; vi, 426 and 5 plates; vi, 436. 300 fr.)

THIS comprehensive work of the veteran French archaeologist, published posthumously, is of the greatest interest to the Orientalist. Tome I. is devoted to "Généralités". Here the author discusses Tertiary Geography, Tertiary Man, the Origin of Life, the Arrival of Humanity in Inland Regions, Glacial Phenomena, the Quarternary Alluviums, the Great Pleistocene Inundations and the Depopulation of the Earth, the

Re-peopling of the Earth, Kamtchatka and its Peoples, the Use of Implements of Stone and their Traces among Disparate Peoples, the Unity of Inner Conceptions, and Chronology. On few of these questions does de Morgan pronounce a definite opinion; the most he can do is to give a résumé of the opinions which have been held. The volume accordingly contains a valuable survey of material pertinent to the discussion of the early history of man. The glacial epoch in the Orient can not be considered apart from the ice age in Europe and America; the same is true of the problems of the origin and distribution of humanity; de Morgan therefore brings into his discussion the whole northern hemisphere. The volume is admirably furnished with charts which portray the contour of the continents in the various epochs discussed, and the extent of the glacial ice-covering. De Morgan places palaeolithic man in the interglacial period, believes that the world was to a good degree depopulated by the floods which followed the break-up of the glacial epoch, and that it was only gradually repeopled by the descendants of those who had taken refuge in mountain-tops during these floods. Neolithic man, accordingly, in de Morgan's opinion, was separated, at least in the Orient, from palaeolithic man by a long interval of time.

The second volume is devoted to Egypt and North Africa. It treats of Palaeolithic Industry in Egypt, Egypt at the Time of the Neolithic and Aeneolithic Industries, the Industry of Polished Stone in Egypt, the Royal Tombs of Naqada, Metals in Egypt, the Chaldaean Origin of the Pharonic Culture in Egypt, Stone Industries in Tunisia, and Palaeolithic Industry in the Land of Somali. The volume is profusely illustrated and is well provided with charts; it contains a wealth of information on the subject of which it treats. The part of the volume from which the reviewer would dissent is the portion which advocates the Babylonian and Elamitic origin of the predynastic Egyptian culture. That influences from these countries entered Egypt at one period of predynastic history is clearly proved, we think, but that is not the whole story; other native elements were then already there, and they soon absorbed the influences from the East.

The third volume is devoted to "Hither Asia", but the term is construed broadly, for one chapter is devoted to China and Japan. The subject, as in the second volume, is treated culturally, the chapters being divided according to the implements used (palaeolithic, neolithic, or metal), as well as by countries. Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Elam are treated in much detail, Ionia and Northern Asia also receiving considerable attention. De Morgan's treatment of the material from Susa and Persia—regions in which he himself did extensive archaeological work—is particularly full and good. The volume concludes with a chapter on the beginnings of writing in the Near East, in which the widely varying systems employed by the Egyptians, Elamites, Babylonians, Hittites, Cretans, Cyprians, etc., are described.

The work as a whole is an important cultural history of the early

Near East, indispensable to the Orientalist and historian. Every scholar has his limitations. One fault of de Morgan's book is that he confined his attention too exclusively to French authorities. Scholars of other nations are not altogether ignored, but, in comparison with the citations from French scholars, are quoted infrequently. Take, for example, the treatment of Babylonian writing in the last chapter of the work; the only authority quoted is Legrain, and Legrain's conclusions are treated as final. A German and an American have written books on the subject, one of which is much more often quoted than Legrain's, but of these de Morgan seemed to be unaware. His work is nevertheless monumental, and places all students of the Near East largely in his debt.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

*Geschichte des Altertums.* Von EDUARD MEYER. Band II., Abteilung I., Zweite Auflage, *Die Zeit der Aegyptischen Grossmacht.* (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta. 1928. Pp. xiv, 620.)

ANCIENT history has become a unity. The middle wall of partition has been broken down, there is neither Greek nor Jew nor barbarian, but all are possessors of a common ancient culture. If any stubborn exponent of the classics still doubts that Greek history is essentially a phase of that earlier ancient history in which the great Oriental powers had the chief part, he should read this volume of Meyer and be converted.

The appearance of the first volume of his *Geschichte des Altertums* in 1884 at once placed Eduard Meyer among the great historians of antiquity. The present generation of American investigators has felt his influence as that of no other single man. Alone among scholars of the older generation, Meyer has been equally at home in the classical and in the Oriental world, and his great influence has always been directed toward the greater recognition of the unity of ancient history.

Since his first volume was printed, it has been four times revised, so rapid has been the increase in our knowledge of these early periods. The second volume has remained unchanged since 1893. Here too there have been great additions to our knowledge, for a volume considerably larger than the original second volume covers only the first part of the new arrangement.

In lieu of a sixth edition of the first volume, he has prefixed a short sketch of the Orient to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The subtitle of the part, "The Period of the Egyptian Domination", rightly emphasizes the chief actor. There is an excellent presentation of the Egyptian Empire, its administration, culture, and religion, in which the traditional exposition is little changed.

To the scholar, perhaps the most important sections are those which place in order the letters from the Amarna archives. The painstaking notes, fixing the relative dating, must be considered one of the most important contributions of recent years. Had the actual letters been

arranged in the suggested order, a few modifications would doubtless have been made.

Recent years have seen a decided reaction against Breasted's "too enthusiastic glorification" of Ikhnaton's reforms, and some have even denied that he deserves to be called a monotheist. In language which is all the more effective because so measured, Meyer supports virtually every detail of Breasted's interpretation. Meyer's authority will doubtless play its part in restoring Breasted's views to favor.

As the author of a separate work on the Hittites, we naturally expect Meyer to give this people a large place in his story. The chief known relations of the Hittites with other peoples are given in the general political narrative, and there are brief sketches of the culture. Meyer admits that the recent sudden outpouring of Hittite documents has been too much for his strength, a complaint that will be echoed by younger scholars.

Babylonia in the second pre-Christian millennium was in decay, and Assyria was just beginning to find herself. Their history does not for this period present the interest of the earlier Babylonian or the later Assyrian history. Nevertheless, these countries deserve more appreciation than Meyer expresses. He is obviously less at home in these countries than in other portions of the Near East, and his few pages show a distinct lack of sympathy, if not of understanding. Phoenicia and the other states of Syria are fully presented, though their culture is depreciated; the Hebrews must wait the second part.

Greece in the second millennium was undoubtedly a part of the ancient world; nevertheless, to separate the chapters on the foundation and establishment of the Egyptian Empire from those on its culture and religion, its decline under Amenhotep III., the monotheism of Ikhnaton, and the return to orthodoxy, by long chapters on Crete and the Cretan culture, and the Greek Mainland and the Mycenaean culture, seems carrying the principle a little too far. The picture of Crete is that which has come to be conventional; Meyer naturally emphasizes equally the enormous influence of the Orient and the utterly different spirit in which these borrowings were utilized.

Meyer's presentation of the Mycenaean period will doubtless excite the greatest discussion. Homeric "Unitarians" will derive no comfort from his pages. The Greek epics are compared to the German, with the result that but little true history survives. He admits that Troy was actually captured by Achaeans from Mycenae, who may have been led by Agamemnon. Achilles comes from a myth, Helen was a goddess from Therapne near Sparta, carried off once by Theseus and once by Alexander, who only later was identified with an equally mythical Paris. Such scepticism is a little dangerous when we recall the hundreds of unexcavated mounds in Asia Minor.

Supposed references to Greeks in the Hittite records fare little better. Alakshandush of Wilusha is not Alexander of Ilios. The sup-

posed references to the Aeolians and the Koranoi, to Troy and Lesbos, to the Homeric Atreus, all are mistaken. Eteocles is permitted to remain as an Achaean in Pamphylia, but he is not the ruler of the same name from Orchomenos nor was his father Andreus. Götz goes Meyer one better and denies the identification with the Achaeans.

References to the history of other times and places are frequent and often suggestive. America is mentioned once. Egyptian art is compared to that of Babylonia and Assyria, much to the disadvantage of the latter. "Wer Amerika kennt, wird den gleichen Gegensatz zwischen dem amerikanischen und dem europäischen Luxus sehr oft empfinden" (p. 321 n. 1). Recent discoveries have shown that America need not take too much to heart the comparison.

A. T. OLSTEAD.

*Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: Age of the Tannaim.* By GEORGE FOOT MOORE, Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University. Two volumes. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 552; viii, 486. \$10.00.)

THE writer of these two volumes is to be warmly congratulated on having done a real service to the cause of Jewish scholarship. For the first time, the reader who wishes to study and understand Judaism as a religion is enabled to do so without having to make allowance for theological bias on the part of the author. Christian students have hitherto had to depend on the well-known works of Weber and Bousset, without knowing, or being able to appreciate, the insufficiency of those guides. There will henceforth be no excuse for the errors and absurdities which have been committed by many who have written on Judaism in recent years, for want of a sound knowledge of the subject, or a trustworthy guide to that knowledge.

Professor Moore writes with an assured mastery of his subject and a complete freedom from partiality, which are rare indeed when the subject is Judaism and the writer a Christian. The reviewer is accordingly relieved from the necessity of pointing out where the judgment of the writer is warped by prejudice and the truth of his presentation of the subject thereby impaired, and he is free to dwell on the substantial excellences of the work.

One of the greatest of these is that the Rabbinical literature is given its right place as the real foundation of what Moore calls normative Judaism. There is no question, amongst those who are competent to judge, that this position is sound, however unwelcome the fact may be to those who are more at home in the Greek of the Apocryphal books than in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Talmud and the Midrash. Moore does not rule out the Apocryphal literature by any means, but he assigns to it only a very subordinate place amongst his sources, and treats it with a sober calmness which must be rather trying to those who have made a cult of the Apocrypha.

Moore justifies his position by the sound plea that the Rabbinical literature is that which the leaders of Judaism in the early centuries have regarded as authoritative and, in a sense, canonical, while they took apparently no notice of the Apocrypha, with the sole exception of Sirach. Every religion is entitled to be judged by the standard which alone it recognizes, and on the evidence of its own acknowledged exponents. Moore's whole book is an expansion of this thesis, and the execution is worthy of the design.

The main substance of the work is a presentation under seven heads of the chief contents of Jewish belief in the early centuries of the common era. To this is prefixed a long introduction, partly historical and partly critical. The historical portion (pp. 3-121) describes the process by which the religion of Israel, as it was at the return from the Exile in 536 B.C., gradually took the form of the Judaism which underlies the Talmud. This process is usually regarded as one by which religion lost its prophetic freedom and became a hard and barren legalism. Moore's treatment of this view is not so much to confute it as to present, out of a more abundant knowledge of the facts, an obviously truer view, the key to which is found in his acute remark that what is called legalism would be more correctly called loyalty.

In the critical portion (pp. 125-216) is given a detailed account of the literary sources from which the knowledge of Judaism is to be drawn, and the principles on which they are to be used.

Then follows the main body of the book distributed under the following heads: I., Revealed Religion; II., the Idea of God; III., Man, Sin and Atonement; IV., Observances; V., Morals; VI., Piety; VII., the Hereafter. Four indexes complete the work.

Moore carefully and easily avoids the mistake, into which Weber has led so many astray, of treating the theology of Judaism as a defined system. It had no system and no authoritative creed. What exactness of definition it needed it assigned to the Halachah, not to the Haggadah; and it is the Haggadah, not the Halachah, which covers the field known in other religions as doctrinal theology. None the less Judaism contained a great deal of theology in solution; and what it contained is set forth both fully and clearly by Moore in the several departments indicated above. They are only so arranged for convenience of treatment, and it would be quite possible to group them otherwise.

It is obviously out of the question, in a short review, to give any full survey of the contents of two bulky volumes. The reader may be fairly sure that he will find something upon every topic which is relevant to the main subject; and, while much may be unfamiliar to him and at times run counter to his previous ideas, yet the evidence for the views which Moore puts forward is clear and well documented. It is presented, too, with a calmness which seeks no help from exaggeration. The sure touch of the master-hand is to be felt on every page.

In so large a book there are doubtless imperfections; and it would be no true acknowledgment of the work of a great scholar to write of it

in terms of extravagant eulogy. It is possible to differ from Moore upon some of the points which he handles. And yet, having read the two volumes from cover to cover, and having some independent knowledge of the subject dealt with, the present reviewer is chiefly impressed by the solid merit of the book. There is nothing showy nor rhetorical in it, no apologetic, and no theological claptrap. What the author set himself to do he has done, and well done. And it is good to know that a third volume is promised, which shall contain notes and excursions upon special points, for which there was not convenient space in the book as it stands. This third volume will be eagerly awaited by those who have already appreciated the two now under review. The chance of further instruction from a "master of those who know" is welcome, on a field where "those who know" are less numerous than those who think they know. It is to be hoped that Moore's work will become widely known, and will take its rightful place as the standard authority on the subject with which it deals.

R. TRAVERS HERFORD.

*The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century, Based on a Study of the Detailed Accounts of Money Borrowed by the Athenian State, I.G. I<sup>2</sup>, 324.* By BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT. [Published for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1928. Pp. 138 and II plates.)

IN 1914, while excavating in the Erechtheum, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens found several small fragments of a well-known inscription (*I.G. I<sup>2</sup>, 324*) which, when complete, contained a detailed account of moneys borrowed from Athena and "the other gods" during the quadrennium 426/5-423/2. Since the time of Boeckh, this fragmentary tablet has been an important source of knowledge about the Athenian calendar. Using the new fragments as a convenient point of departure for a study of the whole inscription, Meritt made two revolutionary discoveries: (a) the *terti* of the inscription, despite the introductory formula "*ἐκ Παναθηναίον ἐσ* [Παναθήναι]", began on the first day of the senatorial year 426/5 and ended on the last day of the senatorial year 423/2; (b) in two places payments were dated by civil month and senatorial prytany. These discoveries enabled him to solve problems which have puzzled generations of scholars.

The monograph begins with a detailed discussion of the inscription. The proposed restorations, logical and mathematically accurate (*cf. plates I. and II.*, containing facsimile and transcript of the inscription as restored), give us for the first time a reliable text which is comparatively complete. The accompanying discussion elucidates the problem of the relation between the senatorial and civil years, showing that Keil, whose theories have been widely accepted, was both right in thinking that the civil year of twelve or thirteen lunar months was not coterminous with the senatorial year of ten prytanies and wrong in his ingeniously recon-

structed senatorial calendar, the inadequacy of which I once demonstrated.

In the second part of the book Meritt analyzes various bits of scattered evidence which bear on the problems of the Athenian calendars, senatorial and civil, during the Peloponnesian War. He is able to fix precisely the character of several years, and his calculations often give us the Julian date for important occurrences. His major theses are two. First, he tries to show that the senatorial year was divided at this time into ten prytanies of 36 and 37 days, so distributed that the year approximated a solar year of about 365½ days. This thesis may be accepted as proved, with one proviso. The evidence is as yet insufficient to show that the approximation was as close as Meritt thinks. In fact, for the years 426/5–407/6, where the evidence is probably adequate, the year averaged about 365½ days; moreover, Meritt's table (p. 118) gives an average of 365¾ days for 28 years, even after a tentative table (p. 115) was revised to suit Meritt's thesis. It will be noted that between 426/5 and 407/6 the Julian date for the first day of the senatorial year shifted from June 30 to July 7. With such a divergence between the senatorial and solar years, it is not proved, to say the least, that the preceding eight years averaged 365½ days and began normally on July 3. The suggestion made on page 88 (*cf.* table, p. 115) and rejected later, that the senatorial year 432/1 began with the summer solstice, seems equally convincing. This was the date of the beginning of the first Metonic cycle.

Meritt also argues that Athens adopted in 432 Meton's plan to adjust the lunar to the solar year by substituting for the old eight-year cycle with three intercalated months a more satisfactory nineteen-year cycle with seven intercalations. But since the first and second periods of nineteen years, as reconstructed, contained eight and six intercalations, distributed very unevenly, *e.g.*, three successive intercalations in the years 419/8–417/6, and none in the four-year period from 410/9 to 407/6, Meritt concluded that Athens adopted the Metonic cycle in principle only. In passing he shows that the known intercalations are equally unsatisfactory for an eight-year cycle. These extreme irregularities, taken into consideration with the admittedly conjectural character of parts of the table and with the fact that the evidence on which the rest of the list is based varies considerably in cogency, suggest that it may still be possible with a few minor alterations to reconstruct a calendar scheme more in accord with the Metonic cycle than we find it in Meritt's tables, although it will probably be necessary to postpone the date for its introduction.

Until Meritt's revolutionary reconstruction of the Athenian calendar is subjected to searching tests, whether by the discovery of new evidence or by the use of old evidence in the light of Meritt's discoveries, it will be impossible to fix the details with certainty. But for the most part Meritt's work is incontrovertible. The monograph is a noteworthy con-

tribution to scholarship, in its field being the most important study which has yet appeared. The student of ancient history who uses it in connection with historians like Busolt and Meyer will readily realize how many chronological errors can now be avoided with its help. For students of Athenian chronology it is indispensable.

A. B. W.

*Mystic Italy.* By MICHAEL I. ROSTOVTEFF. [The Colver Lectures, 1927, Brown University.] (New York: Henry Holt. 1927. Pp. xxii, 176. \$2.50.)

THE interest in the sacred mysteries which played a highly important rôle in the ancient religious life of the Greco-Roman world, seems rather to increase than to slacken. Texts and inscriptions have occupied scholars' attention rather more than the monuments, for they are easier to interpret, and indeed their interpretation is a necessary preliminary for any certain understanding of the latter. But the present book offers "an analysis of certain monuments of Pompeii and of Rome which reflect mystic tendencies in the population of these two places during the early Roman Empire"; its three chapters represent substantially the Colver Lectures given by Rostovtzeff at Brown University in the spring of 1927. The introductory chapter deals with the religious ferment of the Roman world in the early empire; the other two are given to Pompeii and Rome respectively.

The chief Pompeian monuments here elucidated are the wall paintings of the "Villa Mystica", discovered a few years ago not far from the Porta Ercolanense and the "Homeric" house of the "strada dell' Abbondanza". In the sitting room of the former were found certain pictures which scholars agree are connected with the Dionysiac mysteries. Rostovtzeff, however, can not join with those who see in these "seven consecutive acts of a Dionysiac mass held on the occasion of an initiation of a new *mysta*", but he believes rather that the scenes were intended to remind the initiated and the neophyte of mythical precedents of initiation, to recall the experiences of some divine *mystae*, and to exhibit some of the principal symbols of the Dionysiac religion; and he sets forth his interpretations of the several pictures at some length. The original decoration of the underground triclinium in the "Homeric" house also showed seven scenes which likewise appear to Rostovtzeff to represent ritual acts belonging to the mysteries of Dionysus.

The third chapter on Mystic Rome is chiefly devoted to the wall decorations of the Villa Farnesina, many of which are familiar to all who have had an opportunity to admire them in the Museo delle Terme, and to the so-called underground "basilica" outside the Porta Maggiore, discovered in 1917. The former monuments, reinforced by other evidence, notably by the bas-reliefs on terra-cotta plaques which have been published by von Rohden, indicate that the Eleusinian and Dionysiac mysteries were popular among the upper classes of Italy in the first

century A.D. The basilica is unique in many respects: it was apparently the meeting place of some religious sect, probably of a group of Pythagoreans. In his interpretation of the decorations of this structure Rostovtzeff follows in general Carcopino whose book *La Basilique Pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure*, published a year since, has thrown much light on this extraordinary building.

In connection with these important monuments many others are discussed, and Rostovtzeff's interpretations are everywhere interesting and valuable. Not that the author expects to have his views always accepted. In fact, the interpretation of decorative monuments where no text is available to guide the exegesis, is often one of the most delicate and puzzling duties of the archaeologist and historian. But few know their material so well as Rostovtzeff; and certainly none illustrate their works better than he, for this little book contains no less than thirty-four plates, many of which exhibit two scenes each.

A slight inconsistency in statements should be corrected in the next impression: on page 122, the scenes on plates XXVI. and XXVII. are correctly described, but the legends under these plates do not correspond to the statements in the text. At the end is a valuable bibliography. Doubtless the author has now found part of that analysis of religious tendencies prevailing in the city of Rome in the first two centuries after Christ which he says he has sought in vain in La Piana's interesting study: "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire," *Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1927, which is of prime importance for the religious history of the city of Rome in the early Christian centuries.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*La Fin du Monde Antique et le Début du Moyen Age.* Par FERDINAND LOT, Professeur à l'Université de Paris. [Évolution de l'Humanité, dirigée par Henri Berr.] (Paris: Renaissance du Livre. 1927. Pp. xxvi, 513. 30 fr.)

A book which surveys the decline of the Roman Empire and its transformation into the early medieval kingdoms of Western Europe, when it is written by a scholar whose eminence as an authority on medieval history and literature was fittingly recognized by the presentation in 1925 of a volume of essays in his honor,<sup>1</sup> is bound to arouse exceptional interest. The reader will expect from M. Lot a masterly presentation of a difficult subject, and he will not be disappointed. The book is divided into three main sections. The first traces the history of the Roman Empire from Diocletian to Theodosius I.; the theme of the second is the final disruption of the empire, events in the West being

<sup>1</sup> *Mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen Age offerts à M. Ferdinand Lot.*

narrated down to 476, those in the East to 518; the third treats successively of the empire of Justinian and of the progress of the Western kingdoms to the middle of the eighth century. No aspect of the history of these centuries is wholly neglected, for there are chapters on economic history, on social life, on arts and letters, and on religion. As was inevitable within the compass of a single volume, there is some unevenness of treatment.

It would be difficult to name a book of moderate size in which the political and economic history of these five centuries is presented with as much lucidity, general accuracy, and literary charm as in M. Lot's work. It abounds, too, in admirable characterizations, in pregnant phrases, and in arresting historical judgments, which, even if they may not win universal acceptance, are of the utmost value for stimulating further discussion. Thus, we are fascinated by his portrait of Constantine; M. Lot writes convincingly on the sincerity of the emperor's conversion, even if he describes it as "l'acte d'un superstitieux", and says of its origin, "il n'y a qu'une conclusion possible, c'est qu'il a cédé à une impulsion soudaine, d'ordre pathologique ou divin, comme on voudra". His verdict on Justinian seems unduly harsh. Whilst condemning Justinian's policy, M. Lot gives his reader no hint that, without it, the Byzantine Empire would not have survived for centuries to be a bulwark against Oriental aggressions. Amongst the best sections of the book are those devoted to military organization, the caste system of the later Roman Empire, and the institutions of the Merovingians. No less admirable are the pages in which, after analyzing the economic life of the Roman Empire, the author warns against the danger of interpreting ancient commerce and methods of production in the light of modern ideas. "Observons enfin", he remarks, "que les Anciens n'ont pas eu d'idée saine sur la nature du capital productif", and later on he adds: "Ce retour à l'économie naturelle, après l'arrêt de l'économie monétaire, c'est déjà, économiquement, le Moyen Age. Politiquement et socialement, c'est la préface du Moyen Age."

Inasmuch as the greater portion of this work is so excellent, it is a matter for regret that the treatment accorded to literature, religion, and thought is not more adequate. One or two instances of this inadequacy must suffice. Even in a brief sketch it is surely indefensible to dismiss Benedict of Nursia in seven lines and to take no note of Cassiodorus, save as a translator of Sozomen's ecclesiastical history! Nor, from the brief allusions to Augustine and the half contemptuous paragraph assigned to Origen, would any reader divine that these were after all two of the world's master minds. The book concludes with a bibliography containing over seven hundred entries and marred by numerous, and in part serious, misprints. This list is arranged alphabetically; books and periodical articles appear side by side; much that is antiquated is included; and, in spite of the abundance of items, there are important

omissions.<sup>2</sup> If, as is much to be desired, the book attains to another edition, may we not hope that M. Lot will revise the bibliography, with the aim of affording somewhat more guidance to the reader who is not a specialist?

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

*Feudal Germany.* By JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Chicago. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. xxiv, 710. \$5.00.)

THIS imposing volume of seven hundred pages represents the long-continued studies of Professor Thompson in the field of medieval institutional history. It consists of seventeen chapters, each fairly complete in itself, but so arranged as to give a certain chronological sequence to the narrative as a whole. Several of the chapters are reproduced in whole or in part from earlier publications involving occasional repetitions but not more, perhaps, than will serve to impress upon the reader what seem to the author his most important contributions to the general subject.

Two main lines of development are followed throughout: one, the friction between the unifying and the disruptive forces of German political life, and the other the expansion of the German people over the lands lying next to their hereditary seats. This dual interest has determined the division of the volume into two nearly equal parts described respectively as "Old West Feudal Germany" and "New East Frontier Colonial Germany". In the former we find a survey of the changes in political structure from the first imperial institutions of Charlemagne down through the Saxon and Salian periods to the fateful collapse of the Hohenstaufen policy. In this part of the work the author's thesis—so far as he has a thesis—is that the most deep-seated trait of the German people was their unconquerable "particularismus", their loyalty to the lesser units of population, the identification of these human groups with certain territorial sections, and their determined resistance to every attempt to impose upon them any efficient control from above.

It is from this point of view that he expounds the great historic conflict of Guelph and Ghibelline so far as this was related to Germany. He finds in the Saxon-Bavarian Henrys the champions of a theory of a Germanic state made up of federated duchies based upon racial and ter-

<sup>2</sup> We miss the following important books: O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919); F. Wickhoff, *Roman Art* (transl. by Mrs. A. Strong, London, 1900); O. M. Dalton, *Early Christian Art* (London, 1925); J. Strzygowski, *Origin of Christian Art* (transl. by O. M. Dalton and H. J. Braunholtz, London, 1923); B. Linderbauer, *Regula S. Benedicti* (Metten, 1922), which contains a full philological commentary that is indispensable for any student of early medieval Latin. To these we may add two works which were published too late for inclusion in the bibliography: S. Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age* (London, 1926), and O. M. Dalton, *Gregory of Tours' History of the Franks*, 2 vols. (London, 1927).

ritorial traditions, free from the dreams of *Weltmacht* and prepared to lead in the true path of German greatness, the economic and cultural development of the race. In this development the Church, in its local, German, form, would have taken its natural place as an essential element in the people's life. The breakdown of the Guelphic party in Germany meant the indefinite postponement of this ideal. We note here an illustration of our author's fondness for an historical method always of doubtful value, but here more than usually justified, the method of analogy. "Frederick I. and the late Kaiser Wilhelm were fellows of the same school, and had much the same psychology. The latter's speeches ring curiously like those of Frederick I. as found in Otto of Freising and the Lombard chronicles. Egotism, megalomania, *Weltmacht*, obsessed them both—and both in the event ruined the Germany which they ruled." The hero of the book is Henry, the Guelph Lion of Brunswick.

The chapter on German feudalism is a continuous comparison between feudalism on the west and on the east side of the Rhine. Here, and indeed throughout, the author seems to be rather dangerously under the spell of the omniscient Lamprecht, not a safe guide when he ventures out from the collection of material into the alluring borderlands of interpretation. Still the general conclusions as to the fundamental distinctions between German feudalism on the one hand and the feudalisms of England, France, and Italy on the other are essentially sound. English parliamentarism, French monarchical centralization, and Italian municipal independence are rightly contrasted with German tribal consciousness as the determining factors in the shaping of variations upon the one universal phenomenon of European feudalism.

In these conclusions there is little for which the learned author would claim originality. What is here original is the clear and interesting presentation of an involved and confusing subject. As we pass to the second part the nature of the narrative changes with the new orientation. Germany facing westward and southward is a familiar topic in history and legend. Germany facing eastward is a far less well-known field of both historical and literary tradition. Even in the late war the comparative interest of the "two fronts" was immensely in favor of the Western. It is, therefore, with peculiar satisfaction that we welcome this first considerable attempt to give to English readers a clear idea of the vast historic significance of the contact between German and Slav by which the character of Eastern European civilization was determined.

It has always been one of the marvels of history that Charlemagne, apparently with unlimited resources at his command, should have paused in his career of conquest just on the brink of something like universal dominion and confined himself during the last two decades of his life to the upbuilding of an empire resting wholly upon the masses of the continental Germanic peoples. By that policy the line between Teuton and Slav was drawn with entire distinctness for generations to come. To

erase that line, not so much by violent conquest as by the gradual processes of economic and social assimilation, was the task of the Eastern Germanic "nations" during the feudal period—notably of that Saxon stock which to Professor Thompson represents the true kernel of the German race. One feels that he has worked upon this side of his problem with something of that pioneer enthusiasm which he finds in the leaders of the great eastward trek.

Here again he uses effectively the method of analogy. This eastward migration of the Germans he compares, even to the details, with the movement of American pioneers and settlers in our "winning of the West". The ebb and flow of the Teutonic advance are followed with as near an approach to completeness as the comparatively meagre record will permit. The resulting picture is vivid and attractive. It is the expression of a genuine admiration for all that is best in the German character, tempered and controlled by a lively sense of its limitations. As, in the first part, we are constantly reminded of the destructive activities of royal and princely imperialism, so here in the second part the emphasis is steadily on the permanent constructive work of the solid elements of society, "deutscher Kaufmann" and "deutscher Bauer", seeking wider markets for their goods and wider fields for their harvests.

The understanding of many unfamiliar references is made easier by twelve excellent maps and sketches and by an appendix giving genealogical tables, mostly of princely houses. The narrative is accompanied, page by page, with voluminous notes for which the author apologizes, but which add very greatly to the scholarly value of his book.

E. E.

*Histoire de la Fortune Française: la Fortune Privée à travers Sept Siècles.* Par Vicomte GEORGES d'AVENEL. (Paris: Payot. 1927. Pp. 354. 25 fr.)

THIS volume is hardly more than a revised edition of the book issued in 1895 under the title *La Fortune Privée à Travers Sept Siècles* which now becomes a subtitle. This text is itself an abridgment of the first volume of the large work, *Histoire Économique de la Propriété, des Salaires, des Denrées, et de Tous les Prix en Général*, issued in 1894. In the present volume the original text has been very slightly revised; the changes are restricted to the substitution of figures in terms of paper francs of 1927 for "gold francs of 1913". Unfortunately, the figures for the gold franc were not revised between 1894 and 1913, so that the heading in the table is not as accurate as a modern statistician would desire. The paper franc of 1927 is thus rated as one-fifth the gold franc of 1894; and the gold franc of 1894 is rated on a par with the gold franc of 1913. There is, however, a new chapter on changes in wealth and income since the war, and the material in two other chapters has been carried down to 1900, whereas in the earlier works they were brought to a close in 1800.

The statistical work on prices and the purchasing power of money is apparently subordinated to descriptive text, but in fact the whole volume is built around the changes in the purchasing power of money indicated by the statistical computations of the large work. The text is concerned with the influence of the changes in purchasing power upon social organization and economic activities; with the obvious comparisons that are opened up by the computation of a coefficient of purchasing power. The significance of the interpretative text is thus dependent upon the accuracy of the statistical conclusions.

When the larger work and the first edition of the abstract were brought out, these conclusions represented the most substantial and scholarly attempt that had then been made to secure an adequate solution of these statistical and monetary problems in France. The author was among the first to point out the excessive literalism in the work of Natalis de Wailly on the variations in the metallic content of the currency. He likewise won much credit for emphasizing the need of a broader basis for judgment of purchasing power than could be found in the wheat prices that had formed the exclusive or dominant element in the computations of earlier writers. It was clearly important also to emphasize the varying significance of changes in purchasing power to the different classes in the community. In 1894 and 1895 these elements in the valuation of d'Avenel's work gave it great importance.

In this present volume, however, we have hardly more than a reprint of material that has not been revised in the light of the research of this past generation, so that if this present volume is to be appraised as current work it must be judged by different standards than were applicable in 1894. Our knowledge of the monetary history of France has been largely increased by the work of Levasseur, Borelli de Serres, Landry, Blanchet, and Diendonné. It has been shown that d'Avenel's criticism of Natalis de Wailly was sound, but it also appears that he fell into an equally serious error in contending that none of the alterations in the coinage had any influence on prices. This correction makes it essential to study in detail the influence of the alterations of the coinage upon prices, and in the meantime the calculations of d'Avenel must be regarded with great skepticism. Blanchet and Dieudonné in their *Manuel de Numismatique Français* suggest some material changes in coefficients of purchasing power.

In the course of this past generation, too, the statistical methods commonly employed by economists have been notably refined, and in no case so conspicuously as in the field of price studies. In 1894, index numbers were ill understood and poorly made; today the technique of index-number making has been elaborately developed and their merits and defects thoroughly analyzed. No modern economist could accept as adequate so crude a statistical device as d'Avenel's coefficient of purchasing power. The difference in the point of view is eloquently indicated by the fact that d'Avenel regards the changes in prices between 1894 and

1913 as too small to require any revision of his figures. No statistician would be willing to ignore a change of ten per cent., least of all when it marks a turning point in the general price trends. The more advanced monetary theorists would today hesitate to reason about changes in prices over long periods of time with the confidence displayed by d'Avenel. They are inclined to believe that the usefulness of index numbers is greatest in measuring changes over short periods of time, and that no methods are available that can adequately register the extent or the nature of the changes operating over long periods. There are no grounds for the belief that direct comparisons between 1200 and 1800 are significant.

This "new" volume can not, therefore, be used by the general reader with security. It embodies the primary results of d'Avenel's work and will be of interest to critical students to whom the older editions are not readily accessible, but the general statistical conclusions can no longer be accepted without substantial qualifications on every material issue.

ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

*A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West.* By R. W. CARLYLE, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., and A. J. CARLYLE, M.A., D.Litt., Lecturer in Politics in University College, Lecturer in Politics and Economics in Lincoln College. Volume V., *The Political Theory of the Thirteenth Century.* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1928. Pp. xx, 494. 30 s.)

In this fifth volume of his *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West* Dr. A. J. Carlyle has the coöperation of Sir R. W. Carlyle, and throughout the book the pronoun "we" is regularly employed without explanation of any division of labor.

The period treated is the thirteenth century, "greatest of Christian centuries", marked by the triumphant domination of Innocent III. at its beginning and by the colossal failure of Boniface VIII. at its close. The text for the discussion of political theory is given by these two commanding figures. The problem of both, as set forth in their theoretical proclamations, was the same: to justify their political action by theories of divine right as against the rising spirit of national loyalty in the Western world. The antagonism of Church and State is thus the thread along which are strung the manifold speculative details that form the body of the book.

Part I. is devoted to general discussion of the origin and nature of state powers, the rights of rulers and the corresponding obligations of subjects and, conversely, the limitations upon sovereign rights, and the counter-claims of subjects as against their rulers. Of especial interest here is the all too brief chapter on the development of actual representative bodies in several European countries. It serves here as a demonstration of the authors' main contention that in the Middle Ages the source of all power was law, and that the law had its origin, not in any dictation from above, but in the general consciousness of the people as a

whole. This conclusion is held even in the case of the distinctively medieval institution, the empire, as to which the authors restate their former conviction (vol. III.) that the emperor had no power whatever over the direct subjects of any other ruler; in short, that the notion of the Middle Ages as tending toward a universal-monarchical conception of society is a mischievous error which historians ought to do their best to correct.

Part II. fills by far the greater portion of the book (pp. 152-473). It begins with an analysis of Pope Innocent III.'s policy in his dealings with the powers of Europe, especially with the empire, and then devotes two chapters to Frederic II. and his continuous struggle with the papacy. Upon this historical survey follows the theoretical treatment of the issues involved by the canonists of the thirteenth century, culminating in the universal summary of Thomas Aquinas. As to Aquinas's views our authors conclude that, while he would ascribe to the pope full authority in temporal as well as spiritual affairs, he did not accept such authority for the Church in general. The papacy was for him exceptional in that its authority was derived from a special divine commission of which there could be no lawful limitation by any human power.

But, if popes and canonists were ready to set the claims of the *sacerdotium* above those of the *imperium* such was not the case with the jurists, and a chapter is devoted to civilian comment and to practical illustrations of political action independent of clerical control. The fact comes out pretty clearly that, no matter how far individual rulers were willing to go in expressions of loyalty to the papal idea, when it came to action the strong ruler did as he pleased and faced the consequences, trusting in his ability to control the only forces that really mattered, namely, his own subjects, e.g., Rudolph of Habsburg.

If further proof of this fundamental fact were needed, it is to be found in the memorable conflict of Pope Boniface VIII. with King Philip IV. of France to which three chapters are given. The familiar incidents of the struggle are briefly summarized, and attention is centred upon the war of pamphlets from which the most instructive evidence as to the real significance of the great debate may be drawn. The Carlyle thesis is again brought forward: that the extreme claims of the *Unam Sanctam* were promptly repudiated, not merely by the rulers whose powers were attacked, but by the common judgment of competent thinking men.

With that repudiation the medieval peril was once for all averted and the way opened for the free working of the modern spirit. We look forward with interest to the appearance of the sixth volume to which the authors make frequent reference in the course of their narrative.

E. E.

*La Giovinezza di Leone X.* Per G. B. PICOTTI. (Milan: Ulrico Hoepli. 1927. Pp. xvi, 738. 48 lire.)

If the personality of Giovanni de' Medici, whose life up to the expulsion of the Medici from Florence in 1494 is traced in this book, remains indefinite, it is not because the author has failed to bring to bear everything which directly or by implication illuminates his subject; it is because the future Leo X. was a notable example of one whose greatness was thrust upon him. The second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, tonsured at eight and a cardinal at fourteen, would hardly have escaped the limelight in any case; but when this child of no marked capacity became an instrument of his father's designs to preserve the peace of Italy, he was thrust into a leading part in the play. Unluckily it proved in the end to be the Lutheran drama, and as Leo X. he proved unequal to it.

Professor Picotti lays his cards on the table at once. At the outset he reveals frankly his reasoned judgment of the young prelate; and that judgment leaves us with no illusions to accompany us on the subsequent journey through the succeeding chapters. Far from being distinguished by the precocity not uncommon in that age, Giovanni was indolent and backward. Nor does he deserve—and here the author is looking beyond these formative years which are to occupy his attention and ours—the reputation he has gained as patron of scholars and men of letters. Of theology, proceeds our author, still looking at Leo X. rather than Cardinal Giovanni, the subject of this book had no accurate knowledge; he betrays no appreciation of the fine arts except music, in which he was something of an adept. But in fairness he adds that his mentality was not entirely the result of lack of capacity. It was chiefly the result of the cramming system employed to prepare him for the position his father intended him to fill. Of his sincere piety Picotti has no doubt and considers it the more credit to him since the conditions of the time did not oblige him to pretend anything in this regard. The part of Giovanni de' Medici in the famous papal election of 1492 is considered to be worthy of the son of the peace-loving Lorenzo. Giovanni there tried to induce Giuliano della Rovere to transfer his vote to the candidate of the Milanese party, who already commanded most of the votes, though not the necessary sixteen. He failed, and his subsequent reluctance to support Rodrigo Borgia, who suddenly bought up nearly all the cardinals and gave the election a totally different direction, brought about his political eclipse under Alexander VI.

It gives some idea of the solid worth to the scholar of this work of the Pisan historian to say that the nine chapters, of length averaging forty-five pages of closely printed text, are provided with notes averaging over twenty pages for each chapter; that there are excellent illustrations, with brief notes on them in the appendix; that there is an index of personal and place-names. Nor is this a dull book. The titles of the chapters are a foretaste of the literary value of the text. It is to the author's great credit that he has organized so well the mass of material.

He has used the older lives of Leo X.—Paolo Giovio, Fabronio, Roscoe—but it is clear that his real reliance is on the sources, which have never been subjected to a more thoroughgoing examination. He has developed his subject like a good photographer, stopping always when the possibilities of the exposure have been exhausted, and before one part has been developed at the expense of another. Picotti's judgment of Giovanni at the outset seems amply endorsed by the time we close the book, but it must be added that the result is not disappointing. Who minds that Leo X. turns out to be a person of mediocre talents and accomplishment, after this fresh examination of the evidence, as long as the political history of a difficult period has gained by this effort to disentangle some of its threads, with freshness and insight and wealth of learning judiciously employed?

FREDERIC C. CHURCH.

*In Quest of the Western Ocean.* By Nellis M. Crouse, Ph.D.  
(New York: William Morrow and Company. 1928. Pp. xiv,  
480. \$6.50.)

THIS study presents an excellent summary of that portion of European and American exploration which was directed toward the problem of reaching the East through or around the American continent. The writer has given us in great detail the story of that long series of attempts at the commercial exploitation of the riches of Japan, China, and India, which followed the discovery of an eastern route across the Atlantic. The narrative deals first with the historical background that precedes the shift of world commerce from the Mediterranean ports to those of the Atlantic. Then follows a complete account of the trading enterprises of the European states that had for their goal the reaching of the South Sea.

In analyzing the fanciful theories and myths which encumber the subject, the writer has presented an exceedingly interesting discussion. To be sure it might be a matter of question whether the history of these ventures would not be improved by the omission of some of the curious delusions that are dwelt on at such length. The full narration of these fifteenth-century notions of geography certainly does not detract from the popular interest in the work. There is hardly a dull page in the whole book, and the charm of its style arises no doubt from the fact that it has been written for the general reader.

On the other hand the work shows that a most thorough research has been made among the little known sources for the period covered. The range of the works consulted and the care with which they have been used and evaluated gives to the conclusions reached a scholarly value that appeals to the special student in this field.

One could wish that the writer had been somewhat more familiar with the significance of Champlain's strategy when he chose deliberately to ally the French nation with the Algonquins rather than with the Iroquois.

His contribution to western discovery and exploration might have been made somewhat clearer than is the case.

La Salle is dismissed with scant credit as failing to impress Louis XIV. with the significance of his rediscovery of the mouth of the Mississippi. As a matter of fact his last voyage, backed by the favor of the king, was a complete vindication of his whole plan of southwestern exploration, and it certainly laid the foundation for the later French attempts to reach the western sea from New Orleans and St. Louis northwest along the Missouri River.

It is difficult to understand, also, why Grosseilliers, rather than Radisson, is given credit for the English success in establishing the Hudson's Bay Company. While it is true that the former led the first expedition of the English to Hudson's Bay, yet this came about from the unseaworthiness of the ship that carried Radisson, which compelled him to put back to England and leave his partner to complete the voyage without him. The writer evidently overlooked the significant fact that it was Radisson and not Grosseilliers who was at once hired by and remained in the pay of the English company (except for a few years) down to the day of his death. To refuse to recognize, as the writer does, that Radisson and Grosseilliers explored the shores of Hudson's Bay, leaves unexplained their remarkable influence with Charles II. and Radisson's part in guiding the Hudson's Bay Company to the one point on the shore of Hudson's Bay, the mouth of Nelson River, where they could levy tribute on the wealth of furs in the valleys of the Red, the Assiniboine, and the Saskatchewan rivers to the south.

It is a matter of regret, also, that the writer should not have read more carefully the Brymner translation of the Vérendrye journal of 1738. Clumsy and full of errors as this first translation has been shown to be, it is hard to see how the journal could be made to support the statement that Vérendrye visited an Indian village on the banks of the Missouri River in 1738. There is more excuse for the common blunder of translating "folle avoine" as wild oats. The researches of Dr. Jenks, appearing in the nineteenth *Annual Report* of the Bureau of American Ethnology (p. 1013), have settled conclusively the meaning of this phrase. He shows that "folle avoine" has always been used by French writers to mean *wild rice*, the abundant and usual cereal food of all the tribes of the Great Lakes region, and of such Frenchmen as were compelled to winter among them.

The excellent bibliography and the well-selected maps add much to the usefulness of the work. Every scholar will welcome the appearance of this useful compendium of information, covering in such detail so wide a range of facts in the field of early American history.

O. G. LIBBY.

*Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.* Von LUDWIG FREIHERRN VON PASTOR. Band XIII., *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Katholischen Restauration und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges, 1605–1621.* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau and St. Louis: Herder. 1927. Pp. xxvi, 698. 13 M.)

LEO XI., who mounted the papal throne on April 10, 1605, died on the twenty-seventh of that month. Twenty pages suffice for his election and his reign. All the rest of this volume is given to Pope Paul V.; and it is none too much for the pontiff whose papacy saw the approach and the outbreak of the great world war of the seventeenth century and whose personality and policy have been held so largely responsible for that war and for its outcome. By training a canon lawyer and an inquisitor, by temper meticulous, obstinate, litigious, with an extravagant ideal of the function of the Church in the world and of the papacy in the Church, it was he who above all strained to the breaking-point that dominance of ecclesiasticism in human affairs against which all later history has been a reaction. But it is not in this volume of Pastor that one hears such blame. Nowhere have the historian's own ultramontane convictions been so constantly in evidence. Of James of England he can quote with gusto Macaulay's verdict that he was one of those sovereigns whom God seems to send for the express purpose of hastening revolutions; but that Paul deserved a like verdict does not occur to him. He admits, indeed, that the pope's acquaintance with European politics had been small and that he never became really a politician; but the author is more interested by Paul's piety and his personal correctness. Even his nepotism, though admitted, and his diversion of the Church's wealth to the building up of the princely house of the Borghese, seem almost redeemed by the resulting patronage of the arts and the beautifying of Rome.

This volume, like those before it, throws fresh light from Roman archives on every episode in the troubled relations of Church and State—on the schemes and the assassination of Henry of France, on the Gunpowder Plot in England and its sequels, on the career of the false Demetrius in Russia and the Jesuit purging of Poland, on that controversy of the papacy with Venice, which in so many ways was a miniature of the great European struggle to follow. Not that Pastor sees in the Venetian quarrel such significance. To him, as to most ultramontane writers, Sarpi was only a crypto-Calvinist—and this in spite of his confessed inability to see a difference between Calvinist and Lutheran and of a religious attitude quite as horrifying to Lutheran or Calvinist orthodoxy as to Rome herself. Yet even Pastor recognizes that "from the point of view of world-history he helped to undermine the subordination of the secular power to the spiritual, and so to prepare the way for absolutism"; and, though he thinks the papacy the victor, on the whole, in the dispute with Venice, he admits "there can be no doubt that Paul V. had gravely deceived himself as to the outcome of the interdict".

To a wider public than that interested in political history Paul V. is, above all, the pope who called Galileo to account for his teachings and who presided in the Inquisition at the condemnation of Copernicanism. The dozen pages devoted by Pastor to this episode are moderate and well informed. His conclusions, however, differ little from those of Grisar, of Adolf Müller, of Pierre Duhem, and his research reveals to us nothing new. For Galileo he has admiration, perhaps even liking, but he rates low his purely astronomical achievements and thinks that "for science as for Galileo it would doubtless have been better if after his first astronomical discoveries he had gone back to physics, his proper field". That the great scholar presumed to explain Scripture into harmony with his Copernican views is to Pastor, of course, a meddling with theology; and small enough is his sympathy with Galileo's struggle to save the Church from committing herself to the conservatives. Yet Pastor, too, finds it "deeply to be deplored that the book of Copernicus also was laid under prohibition"; and he finds comfort in pointing out, with Duhem, that "theological objections to the new world-system were first publicly uttered on the Protestant side". But his data in this connection lack sadly in accuracy. Luther's growl, in his table talk, was hardly a public utterance. Osiander's preface was still less a public objection, and it belongs, of course, to 1543, not 1541. Melanchthon's text-book of physics, which marshalled against Copernicanism the Scripture texts, was indeed not sent to press till 1549; but it was made up of his Wittenberg lectures, which from the first had given semi-publicity to his scruples. Tycho Brahe's similar arraignment was printed in 1587, not 1578. Nor is it accurate to say that "Calcagnini taught before Copernicus that the sun stands still and the earth moves". Calcagnini's chair at Ferrara was of literature, not astronomy; and the little essay in which half-whimsically he maintains that the earth revolves while the heavens stand still was only after his death (1541) found among his papers and published (1544) by the friend who edited them. That even his closest friends knew aught of it before, no evidence has yet been found. But these oversights are exceptional flecks in a careful book.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*Sir Francis Drake's Voyage around the World, its Aims and Achievements.* By HENRY R. WAGNER. (San Francisco: John Howell. 1926. Pp. x, 543. \$10.00.)

THIS handsome book, with 69 illustrations of maps, charts, and views, and four portraits of Drake, constitutes the largest collection of material relating to Drake's voyage that has been published. Its contents are divided into two parts, the first consisting of a preface, an introduction, and Mr. Wagner's "reconstruction" of the voyage. Part II., "Documentary", contains extracts from original English and Spanish documents, with certain noticeable omissions. Under the heading "Maps" thirteen are interestingly discussed. The reproductions of seven are,

unfortunately, so greatly reduced that they are illegible. Eight appendixes follow: reprints of documents, only one of which relates to Drake's voyage.

In his preface Mr. Wagner explains: "having made in person and through agents in London and Seville, for three years a continued search for further evidence", and thinking it "hardly likely that any other document of real value will be discovered in the future", he considered it "not inopportune to attempt once more to reconstruct the voyage . . . and restore the enterprise to its true status . . .". Such a restoration appeared to him to be greatly needed for, in his opinion, Drake's contemporaries (notwithstanding their opportunities) had utterly failed to recognize and comprehend the real object of his voyage; and during subsequent centuries Englishmen have continued to overestimate his achievement because "his circumnavigation of the globe appealed to their pride and they flattered themselves that a fellow-countryman of theirs had been the first after Magellan to accomplish what seemed to them a marvellous feat".<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Wagner advocates the view that when Drake set out, instead of intending to encircle the globe, he was bent on a vulgar enterprise, for trading purposes only, directed towards the Moluccas and possibly China. Mr. E. F. Benson has recently pointed out that "among the many fatal objections to this view are, (1) there would have been no reason for concealing the voyage from Burleigh if this was the case; and (2) the expedition, instead of taking the fabulously difficult route which included the passage of Magellan Strait, would have sailed eastwards".<sup>2</sup>

In any new work on Drake's voyage interest naturally centres on the treatment of two important, much-discussed episodes: the Doughty case and the place of anchorage on the northwest Pacific Coast. In dealing with the first it is noteworthy that Mr. Wagner omits from his list of original sources an entire set of documents and refers to them only in a note as follows: "In the Harleian MSS. 6221, folio 7, is a paper entitled *The sense of Thomas Doughty his oration upon the Pelican when he came from the prize to the Pelican to remain, the Company being called by the boatswain together*. This paper is in the same volume with some other documents relating to Doughty, printed in Appendix I. of the *World Encompassed*. It is printed in Corbett [Drake and the Tudor Navy], vol. I., p. 223. He seemed to attach some importance to it but in this I cannot agree with him."<sup>3</sup> The supreme importance of this oration, in which Doughty acknowledges that Drake had his authority from the Queen and her Council "such as hath not been committed almost to any subject afore this time—to punish at his discretion with death or other ways offenders" was not only recognized by Julian Corbett

<sup>1</sup> Page 15. Instead of "flattered themselves" Mr. Wagner surely means "felt flattered".

<sup>2</sup> *Francis Drake*, p. 105 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> P. 465 n. 13.

but has since been amply demonstrated by Mr. Geoffrey Callender who points out that "the calumniators of Drake have studiously ignored [Doughty's speech] from Mr. Vauz's day to our own".<sup>4</sup> Mr. Wagner's omission of the Harleian MS. defines his position.

In his chapter on "Drake's Anchorage" he advances the novel theory that it was in the small Trinidad Bay, situated north of Cape Mendocino (in  $41^{\circ} 38' N.$ ) that Drake landed, this being the one which "most resembles that displayed on the Hondius broadside, . . . and the size and shape of the bay conform very closely to those shown on the Hondius plan except that the southeast side does not extend to the southwest as shown therein, but tends almost south".<sup>5</sup>

The fact that an island is represented on the Hondius plan lying parallel to the head and that there is no island occupying a similar position off Trinidad Head might seem to constitute an unsurmountable barrier to an identification of Trinidad Bay with "Portus Novus Albionis". With remarkable ingenuity Mr. Wagner surmounts the obstacle by declaring: "The fact appears to be that it [*i.e.*, the island on the Hondius plan] is not intended to be an island at all, but simply a part of the head itself, which, on the pen-and-ink sketch from which the engraving was made, was not shown clearly as attached to it. . . ." "Trinidad Head has an excrescence almost exactly like that shown on the Hondius plan."

The reviewer refers the reader, for comparison, to the inset of the Hondius broadside as reproduced by Mr. Wagner opposite page 417, on which the narrow channel separating the island from the main land is visible, and invites a comparison with the same, as published by Mr. Wagner opposite page 154, alongside of a chart of Trinidad Bay and Head so reduced in size as to render an actual comparison impossible. It will be seen that in this the channel seems to have vanished and the island to be transformed into a real excrescence.

The second piece of evidence which Mr. Wagner produces as "an indication that Drake was in this bay" is the fact that when Heceta entered it in 1775 he found the natives carrying iron knives, resembling *machetes* (one of which bore its maker's mark) "in wooden sheaths hung by cords from the wrist or neck". Mr. Wagner states that Heceta's allusion to *machetes* "recalls . . . de Anton's remark about the *machetes* Drake had on his ship" and that "it seems probable then that the knives found in Trinidad by Heceta were relics of Drake's expedition".<sup>6</sup> The reviewer agrees with Mr. E. F. Benson<sup>7</sup> that, "Mr. Wagner damages rather than supports his case by arguing that because Bruno Heceta in 1775 found natives there in possession of iron knives, these were given their forefathers by Drake two hundred years before"!

<sup>4</sup> "Drake and His Detractors," in *Mariner's Mirror*, VII. (1921) 144.

<sup>5</sup> P. 156.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 157, 158.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 160 n. 1.

Anton specified that the "machetes" carried by Drake were "machetes de rozar". In "New Light on Drake" the editor, Mrs. Nuttall, backed by standard dictionaries, translated these as "sickles".<sup>8</sup> Mr. Wagner charged her with having made a mistranslation; her refutation of this charge and Mr. Wagner's rejoinder have recently appeared.<sup>9</sup>

Limitations of space prevent the reviewer from pointing out certain misstatements, misreadings of Spanish words, mistranslations, and omissions, which render it advisable for the student to read Mr. Wagner's text and theories with caution. Notwithstanding its defects however, because of the valuable collection of material it contains, not only relating to Drake's Voyage, but also to the Fenton expedition, Mr. Wagner's publication and its many bibliographical notes will prove to be a useful and convenient book of reference.

ZELIA NUTTALL.

*The Privy Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1603-1784.* By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER, Ph.D., Professor of European History in the Johns Hopkins University. Volume II. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. xii, 507. \$7.50.)

WITHIN a year after the appearance of his first volume on *The Privy Council in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* Professor Turner has published the second. Much the same characteristics are manifest here as in the preceding installment: on the one hand, painstaking accumulation of original records coupled with a cautious and honest effort to interpret their meaning; on the other, a formidable array of illustrative matter, more extensive, indeed, than seems essential to bring out the institutional developments with which the author is concerned. In the present volume the chapters (XVII.-XXIX., inclusive) are respectively entitled: Failure of the Reform of 1679; the Privy Council after 1679; the Privy Council, King, and Parliament after 1679; Work of the Privy Council after 1660; Local Regulations, Plantations, and Routine; Temporary and Particular Committees of the Privy Council; Standing Committees of the Privy Council, 1603-1645; Standing Committees of the Council, 1649-1660; Standing Committees of the Privy Council after the Restoration; Associated Councils and Council Committees; the Board of Trade; the Committee of the Whole Privy Council; Procedure and Work of the Committee of the Whole Privy Council.

In his desire to be transparently clear Professor Turner indulges in an occasional recapitulation; at the same time, in tracing various aspects of the development he jumps back and forth from the early seventeenth to the late eighteenth century with a celerity that tends to leave the reader a bit breathless. In spite of excursions into the previous period, the

<sup>8</sup> Hakluyt Society Publications, second ser., XXXIV. 16, 175.

<sup>9</sup> Hispanic American Review, VIII. 253.

writer's professed aim is to continue in this second volume the study of the Privy Council "from 1679 to the latter part of the eighteenth century, when it had lost to the cabinet and to various departments earlier activity and power". His concern is largely with "various council committees—temporary and standing committees of limited membership, and the committee of the whole privy council". More briefly and "with hesitation" he has included "those subsidiary councils of war and of trade and of foreign plantations, which appear sometimes beside council committees, sometimes in their stead and then disappear as committees and again supersede them". The Board of Trade, although much has been done in most of its aspects, he treats especially in the less considered phase of its relation to the Council and the committee of the whole Council. Here, as in all cases where he has been indebted to the findings of predecessors, he renders ample acknowledgment. In considering the scope of the work it should be noted that: "account of the all-important committee of foreign affairs has been virtually excluded, however, since that, in the author's scheme, is best given in the first volume of his study of the cabinet council, to be published later."

Beyond indicating, with more illustrative matter than has hitherto been brought together, the vast and miscellaneous business which the modern King's Council transacted, Professor Turner aims to trace all the slow and halting stages by which, from a Privy Council primarily an agent of the sovereign, was evolved a Cabinet Council responsible above all to the majority party in Parliament. Incidentally, in this connection, a distinction is brought out that has not been generally realized: while George I. and George II. ceased to attend Cabinet meetings they almost invariably appeared at meetings of the Council. The difficulty and interest of the whole study is enhanced by the difference between theory and practice; for example, the king was supposed to apply to the Council for such advice as he desired; nevertheless, the royal powers were constantly being encroached upon by the more puissant ministers.

Perhaps the meatiest summary of the author's main thesis is contained in pages 103–105, where there is a sketch of the emergence and development of the committee of the council for foreign affairs, "by outsiders called the cabinet-council"; here also we are shown how decreasing remnants of power were left to committees, until, except for "formality and sanction", the bulk of the work was done in "the committee of the whole council". One suggestive bit deals with the origin of the modern administrative departments (pp. 298–299). On pages 211–212 there is another résumé, which, together with those to be found on pages 402–403 and 415–417, will be of great help to the hasty reader. However, the effect of many of the generalizations is somewhat blurred by appended illustrations, and the whole volume ends with a curious abruptness.

An appendix of forty pages is divided into three parts. The first labelled "Additions" has to do chiefly with numbers and personnel and

places of meeting of the Privy Council in the earlier period. The second comprises a page of corrections, mostly of typographical errors. The third contains an extensive bibliography largely of sources.

Few statements of fact seem to call for comment. However, the assertion (p. 126) that "interference with legislation made by parliament was definitely forbidden by the Bill of Rights" while essentially true is a bit misleading. That document provided that "no dispensation by *non obstante* . . . shall be allowed . . . except in such case as shall be specially provided for by one or more . . . bills to be passed during this present session of parliament". Also, the statement (p. 157) that "to go abroad it was still necessary to obtain leave of the King or privy council" involves a long, complicated story and necessitates some amplification. Labaree and Moody's "The Seal of the Privy Council", in the *English Historical Review*, April, 1928, which contains some criticisms of moment to Professor Turner, appeared too late to be considered in the present volume. In general, it may be said that the author has covered with much thoroughness another considerable stage in his attempt to survey and report on the bulk of the materials that relate to the Privy Council at the period when the Cabinet was about to take shape.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Eighteenth Century Documents relating to the Royal Forests, the Sheriffs, and Smuggling.* Selected from the Shelburne Manuscripts in the William L. Clements Library by ARTHUR LYON CROSS, Hudson Professor of English History in the University of Michigan. [University of Michigan Publications in History and Science, vol. VII.] (Ann Arbor: Clements Library, 1928. Pp. xviii, 328. \$3.00.)

THIS is the first instalment of what, it is hoped, may speedily become a series of publications of selections from the papers of Lord Shelburne preserved in the William L. Clements Library. The items in this volume are of a type familiar to students who have searched through the papers of eighteenth-century Cabinet ministers. They will be of interest and will afford material information to the much-needed historian of administrative reforms in that maligned century.

Professor Cross has provided little material to identify the authors of the documents published or to describe the circumstances which gave rise to them. He has chosen rather to use his editorial space for three historical essays on the "Royal Forests", "Sheriffs", and "Smuggling" respectively, corresponding to the several categories in which he has arranged the documents selected for publication. These essays, for the most part, serve very well the purpose for which they were intended, though the description of the method of choosing the sheriffs (pp. 19 f.) is not adequate or scarcely accurate in so far as it is meant to pertain to the practice in the eighteenth century. Moreover, in view of the commission set up by act of Parliament in 1780 to "examine, take, and state

the public accounts" (20 Geo. III. c. 54), which began immediately to be active, it is scarcely correct to speak of Pitt as starting investigations leading to reforms in the administration of the revenue (p. 26), though some of the more important reforms that ensued came in his administration.

The papers on the forests, which constitute nearly half of the bulk of the volume, refer to such matters as the provision of timber for the royal navy, the revenues from the forests, disputed rights of tenants in them, and the encouragement of the production of food. The papers in the sections on the sheriffs and on smuggling deal largely with current defects in the machinery for collecting the public revenues and with suggested remedies. The paper on the sheriffs, perhaps the most interesting document in the collection, is primarily concerned with the sheriff in his relation to the "King's Revenues". A curious item (p. 245), though the editor does not identify it, is a memorandum of the allowances in 1782 from the secret-service fund to pay the salaries of the staff at the post-office, who opened and copied for the use of the king and his ministers letters passing into and out of the kingdom.

The book has an appropriate format. An ampler index and more notes concerning the persons who produced the documents and who are mentioned in them would have been helpful to users of the volume. Inevitably there are a few typographical errors. Among those noted were "1913" for "1912" (p. viii), "1783" for "1683" (p. 30), and "I" for "J" (pp. 304 and 321). (The last was probably the fault of the writer of the manuscripts; but Pownall's name was John, so his correct initial would seem to have been "J".)

W. T. LAPRADE.

*The Armies of the First French Republic and the Rise of the Marshals of Napoleon I. The Armée du Nord.* By Colonel RAMSAY WESTON PHIPPS. (London: Oxford University Press, 1926. Pp. xxii, 362. 18 s.)

THIS work, which was edited by the son of the author, Charles F. Phipps, likewise a colonel in the Royal Artillery, is noteworthy for two reasons—first, for the immense amount of information which it contains, particularly for the military student of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, and, secondly, for the manner in which that information is conveyed to the reader. Although an exhaustive list of the authorities quoted is given at the beginning of the book (pages xv–xxii) and notwithstanding that almost every page is comprehensively documented and adequate maps are supplied, the narrative is that of that type of the gallant gentleman whose life was spent as "a soldier of the Queen" and in contributing to the greatness of the British Empire, who narrates to his listeners the facts which he has gathered, after his retirement from the army, in the pursuit during long years of his favorite hobby. There is, consequently, nothing of the stilted about the narrative, which gains in charm and interest by its very informality.

Colonel Phipps's postulate is that "The Consulate and the Empire cannot be judged until the Revolutionary period has been studied in detail" (p. 12), and he very properly develops his thesis on those lines, at the same time tracing the careers of the future marshals through a labyrinth of incessant changes in military organization and through the campaigns of 1791-1797, which were chiefly notable for the fact that, with few exceptions, they demonstrated how war ought *not* to be conducted. Indeed, Pichegrus campaign of 1794-1795, during which Lieutenant-Colonel Lahure captured the Dutch fleet locked fast in the ice (pp. 329-330), proved an invaluable lesson to the future Duke of Wellington, who at least learned from his first campaign, in which "the folly and sloth" of the allied generals was incredible (p. 318), "what one ought not to do", and, as he remarked in later years, "that is always something" (p. 333). Colonel Phipps's narrative is largely confined to the "Armée du Nord", which was by all odds the most important of the French armies at that epoch, but, as he pertinently observes, its commanders "seldom seemed to consider their army as one force" (p. 350), so that it "was not a good school", "all the more so as it had been victorious and had met no hostile commander to 'teach' it" (p. 351). Moreover, the taint of treason had characterized many of its own commanders, and much of its history was "written in the blood of its officers, slaughtered by their own countrymen" (p. 352).

The baleful influence upon military operations exercised by politicians, and the consequent imperilling of national existence, are no novelties in history, but the *acme* was unquestionably reached during the post-revolutionary period in France when "a new hell" was opened to French officers (p. 11), who found themselves between worse Scylla and Charybdis than did ever ancient navigator. On one hand, the commanders who won victories were regarded askance as a menace to civil and national liberties; on the other, those who failed were ruthlessly deposed, and both were likely victims to the "'guillotine sec' or transportation", and the real guillotine (p. 12), which worked overtime to satisfy "the Revolutionary mania for dismissing or beheading Generals and commanders" (p. 15). "There was no question of peace between Frenchman and Frenchman, but only of which party should slay the other. Sick of the struggle, the best manhood of France sought shelter with the armies on the frontier. There stood officers and men, as if on an embankment between two seas of blood, happy if they did not slip into that behind them" (pp. 12, 51). "Between 1791 and 17th July, 1792 five hundred and ninety-three Generals had been replaced" (p. 20), so that it was not surprising that the rulers of the French Revolution effectively destroyed "the whole framework of the army and the system of obedience on which the existence of an army depends" (p. 38), nor that the belief prevailed in the army "that a step in the higher grades brought an officer so much nearer to the scaffold" (p. 15), until many sought demotion to the ranks rather than to remain officers.

To cap the climax of folly, the Convention, on April 30, 1793, decreed the system of the *représentants en mission*, whereby it established 11 armies, to each of which it sent representatives, usually four, invested with unlimited powers. Ostensibly their rôle was to act in concert with the commanders; in practice their function was that of hampering all military operations to the maximum and of acting as spies with power to trump up the flimsiest of excuses whereby a general could be denounced for alleged treason and sent to his execution, as was Custine because he sought to restore discipline (pp. 21-22). Many of these representatives aspired to command, but the lengths to which they pushed their unlimited powers often acted as a boomerang, because the troops, enraged at the indiscipline and general demoralization created by their interference, turned on them in fury and hooted or mobbed them. To avoid being captured themselves, certain representatives agreed to the disgraceful capitulation of Mayence on July 23, 1793. The mere presence of these gentry was a constant reminder to each commander of the prospect of "a felon's fate, a dishonoured grave and execrated name" (pp. 22-24).

Small wonder that "far from the fervour of the Representatives being a cause of the success of the armies, the period of these men's greatest power was also the period of the most foolish warfare and the greatest waste of men" (p. 26). And still smaller wonder that the "French officers, who had known the disasters, cruelties, and bewilderment of the Republic" were ripe, even eager, to accept the yoke of a Napoleon, "of the Soldier who could lead them to victory and of the Statesman who could give France internal peace. Their reasons were written in blood" (p. 10), until Napoleon "trundled all the Revolutionary nonsense into the dust bin" (p. 39). And the marvel was, "as Mahan says with great truth, 'If ever, for good or ill, men had the single eye, it was to be found in the French soldiers of 1793, as they starved and bled and died that the country might live'" (p. 289).

Colonel Phipps points out that "at the beginning of the French Revolution the French army was fine enough, . . . well disciplined, and the class of . . . non-commissioned officers was especially good" (p. 13). The regular troops soon became honeycombed with the new principles to the detriment of discipline, and the conditions were rendered worse by the infusion of volunteer battalions and other levies, culminating with the *levée en masse* decreed by the Convention on August 16, 1793, and undermined by the emigration of the nobles and the propaganda of the Revolutionary agents (pp. 13-19). However, like flowers which grow in swamps, came the *amalgame*, decreed on January 28, 1794, whereby a battalion of regulars formed the nucleus for each new demi-brigade, which was comprised chiefly of volunteer units. "A second *amalgame* in 1796, completed in 1799, swept away the last vestiges of the early confusion and produced the regiments of the Consulate and of the Empire", as well as the innovation of horse-artillery, skirmishers, and "the system

by which armies moved without magazines or supplies" (pp. 31, 35, 39, 40, 41). To the military reader Colonel Phipps's chapter (III.) on "The Amalgame" is of great interest, but lack of space precludes an analysis here.

The future twenty-five marshals he divides into three classes, *viz.*, the officer class, the soldier class, and the civilian class. Of the first the most noteworthy were Berthier, Kellermann, Davout, Macdonald, and Marmont; of the second, Ney, Murat, Soult, Bernadotte, and Massena; of the third, Bessières and Lannes, the last being the only Gascon by birth. Nine were officers of the Royal Army (regulars) and others belonged to the class which ordinarily furnishes the rank and file, so that they can not be properly "described as a mass of leaders rising from a rough soldiery", particularly as "almost all were, or ought to have been, well or fairly educated" (pp. 41-48). If rapidity of promotion be any criterion of their merits it is not surprising that Bernadotte, who was the only Protestant, ended on the throne of Sweden, considering that he was a lieutenant in November, 1791, and a general of division in December, 1794 (pp. 55, 60).

Colonel Phipps describes the three armies formed on December 14, 1791, to defend the north-eastern frontier of France, the "Armée du Nord", the most important until 1794; the "Armée du Centre" under La Fayette, and the "Armée du Rhin" under Luckner; and he gives an interesting account of the successive commanders of the first, Rochambeau, Jourdan, who resumed his trade as a haberdasher in January, 1794 (p. 273), Pichegru—"one of the most interesting figures of this period" (p. 74), whose extraordinary daring in standing in 1792 with his back to the Argonne, which he styled "the Thermopylae of France" (p. 118), even Napoleon considered too audacious (p. 131)—and Moreau, who assumed command in March, 1795. He also traces through the manifold changes of the campaigns the careers and services of the future marshals and generals who belong to history, and who, by 1794, began to "emerge from the crowd" (p. 318).

There is so much "meat" in Colonel Phipps's book that it is impossible to do it justice in a brief *critique*. The reader who is interested in the period of which he treats or who desires to understand why Napoleon was able to organize such magnificent fighting machines as he possessed in the campaigns of Italy, Egypt, and Marengo, as well as in the "Grande Armée", whereby he dazzled the entire world, can find in no other book so much to afford him that understanding as he will in Colonel Phipps's remarkable work.

FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER.

*Napoléon et les Juifs.* Par ROBERT ANCHEL. (Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France. 1928. Pp. xxxi, 598. 75 francs.)

NAPOLEON may have been a son of the Revolution, as he declared, but in his treatment of the Jews he was in part moved by the prejudices

and suspicions characteristic of the Old Régime. Practical considerations also influenced him, for the situation in the departments of the Upper and Lower Rhine had become critical. The peasants had apparently fallen into the hands of Jewish money-lenders, and wild rumors were abroad that all the farms would soon be controlled by usurers. The local authorities talked of the danger that the peasants would rise and massacre their tormentors. Napoleon, as M. Anchel explains, had been made aware of the trouble long before he became emperor, but after the Austerlitz campaign, on his way back to Paris, he stopped at Strasbourg and heard the complaints more directly. M. Anchel also says: "Son instinct d'organisateur méthodique devait le porter à rétablir l'ordre intérieur du culte juif." The need of this appears plainly from the author's first chapter, dealing with the consequences of the Revolution for the Jews and with the situation until 1806. The Constituent Assembly, true to its mission of liberty, had endeavored to free the Jews, but it had not comprehended the effects of freedom upon communities so unique, which had been restricted and regulated not only by hostile legislation, but also by their own protective habits and taboos. They formed a foreign substance in the body politic. Moreover, there were Jews *and* Jews. Those of eastern France, commonly called "German", lived on a distinctly lower level than the "Portuguese" Jews of the south. That the "German" Jews were the plague of the Alsatian peasant was not, as the author shows, altogether their fault. Money-lending had been one of the few occupations permitted them, and even in Napoleon's day certain bishops tried to maintain the earlier Christian prohibition against taking interest. It is also true that no legal rate of interest was established in France until as a consequence of this very question. M. Anchel believes that the fundamental cause for the troubles in Alsace was the financial disorders which followed the collapse of the assignats. He thinks the evil greatly exaggerated and that it would have corrected itself, without Napoleon's decrees. His account of the effect of the Revolution upon the Jewish communities, upon their religious life, as well as upon their trade practices, in short upon the transition from the earlier oppression to the newer freedom, should interest the sociologist quite as much as the historian.

The principal theme of the work is the origin and character of the decrees of May 30, 1806, and of March 17, 1808. The first struck a blow at usurers in eight departments, especially in the Upper and Lower Rhine, while the second checked and controlled Jewish money-lending through an elaborate system of restrictions. On March 17 also laws provided for the reorganization of Jewish religious institutions. In the discussions preparatory to the decrees of 1808 the Jewish Assembly of 1806 and the Grand Sanhedrin of 1807 played a reluctant part, and to these the author gives four of his chapters. His narrative is based upon very extensive manuscript material, much of which has passed in recent years into the national archives from the former ministry of worship.

The bibliography, containing not only lists of manuscripts, but also of books and pamphlets, with comments on their value, will serve as a guide to other students of the subject.

One of the most interesting facts brought out in M. Anchel's chapters is the struggle for influence over Napoleon's opinion between liberals like Beugnot and Champagny, who cherished the tradition of 1789, and conservatives like Molé, whose words illustrated the prejudices of the Old Régime. Sometimes Napoleon himself talked like a "fundamentalist" of the period; saying, for example, on one occasion that he did not propose to relieve the race from the effects of the curse which rested upon it. One of the most curious notions which Napoleon entertained was that the "handpicked" body, called the Grand Sanhedrin, would be accepted by the whole Jewish world as capable of modifying Jewish teaching and tradition. However, so far as religious re-establishment was concerned, M. Anchel believes that the Jews benefitted by the Napoleonic measures. They did not suffer greater loss of freedom than did the Catholics by the Organic Articles; quite the contrary. In his other legislation of 1808, two considerations besides the problem of usury seem to have moved Napoleon. He was anxious to put an end to the practice among the Jews of finding substitutes when they were conscripted. He thought the army an excellent school for their youth. He also desired to break down the resistance of the Jewish authorities to mixed marriages. His legislation upon Jewish credits M. Anchel thinks did more harm than good. Indeed he calls the period immediately following the decree of March 17, 1808, the "Régime of Oppression". Its rigors were soon modified, but the law was to run ten years, so that the system outlasted Napoleon. One of the most interesting chapters in the volume deals with the supplementary law of July 20, 1808, which compelled the Jews to regularize their names, making the system similar to that in use among Christians.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

*Greece.* By WILLIAM MILLER, LL.D. [Modern World.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1928. Pp. 350. \$5.00.)

In the series known as the Modern World the aim of the editor and authors is rather less historical than descriptive. While history regularly takes the first place, and in Yeung's *Egypt* is carried through the whole book, ordinarily a picture of present circumstances is given, with only sufficient narrative to introduce the reader to conditions since the Great War.

In Dr. Miller's *Greece* less than one hundred pages may be accounted narrative history. Chapter II. sketches the one hundred years from the beginning of the Greek Revolution in 1821, chapter III. covers the troubled period from 1920 to the abdication of King George II. in 1924, and chapter IV. discusses the subsequent three years of the Greek republic. The other fourteen chapters are descriptive, each dealing with

aspects of importance toward the understanding of present day Greece. Among the subjects discussed are the relations with each neighbor, internal politics, the church, the press, literature, education, economic conditions, and the military situation. The problem of the settlement of the fifteen hundred thousand refugees from Asia Minor is treated, the new constitution of 1927 is outlined, while two spirited chapters characterize the principal personalities now active in Greece and describe the physical state of the rapidly growing city of Athens; in this connection it is worthy of note that Athens as an urban centre has become as large as Constantinople, and has surpassed that city commercially, its port the Piraeus being now reckoned as the third on the Mediterranean (pp. 176, 274).

William Miller has been interested in Greece for a third of a century. During twenty years he has produced a series of books and articles which have covered many phases of Greek and Near Eastern history from the year 1204 until now (a list is given, pp. 340-341). Probably no living person is equally well versed in the historical and political facts which concern Greece and the Greeks during the last seven centuries. Intimate acquaintance and warm sympathy are revealed on every page. The writer attempts to avoid partizan bias and prejudices, without being wholly successful, either as regards Greece or England. An earnest attempt however is made to be fair to the small neighbors and rivals of Greece—Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, and Turkey—and to the larger rivals of Greece and competitors of England—Italy, France, Germany, and Russia.

If there are errors among the vast number of informational details which Dr. Miller presents, they can be discovered only by a critic with similar precise knowledge. In fact, the chief adverse criticism that might be brought against the book is that the details are too many and some of them too insignificant. Undeniably many of the small points cited are piquant. Still it was perhaps hardly necessary to introduce "the spontaneous gesture of a British athlete in embracing his Greek competitor" when a British athletic team visited Greece in April, 1927 (p. 114). Occasionally also there is needless repetition; it is said in regard to Captain Hastings, that "his heart, found in his friend Finlay's house, reposes in the English Church at Athens with an inscription giving the wrong day of his death" (p. 113); the wrong dating is repeated on page 210, and the bestowal of the heart on page 276.

The undue emphasis on detail is more conspicuous because of a relative neglect of larger generalizations and ruling ideas. Dr. Miller is not unacquainted with nationalism, imperialism, capitalism, and communism, but he glances at such powerful active forces only occasionally, and indeed may be said to regard each of them as only another detail. In this he shows a very marked contrast to the attitude of Mr. Arnold Toynbee toward Turkey in his companion book.

The total effect of Dr. Miller's book is to make present day Greece distinctly human and real. After perusing it carefully the reader is able to appreciate new events in Greece with sympathy and without undue surprise. The fact that the author differs from most writers on Greece in not having his mind crowded with pictures and quotations from the classic past, gives a distinctly modern quality to the impression of the book. Probably the average educated Greek is much more conscious than was Mr. Miller, when writing this book, of the great ancient days; this causes him to live under various illusions, which likewise have deceived most foreigners in estimating modern Greece. With Homer, Pericles, and Aristotle in mind, any modern Greek is apt to seem insignificant, and those who picture vividly the struggle of ancient Greece and Persia, the rivalry of Athens and Sparta, and the conquests by Philip of Macedon and the capable generals of Rome, may not value highly the battles of the Balkan wars, the present rivalry with Italy, or the expulsion of the Greeks from Turkey with the resulting virtual consolidation of the nation within its present boundaries. These modern personalities and readjustments are however matters of distinct significance in the twentieth century. And the Greece of today, chastened by defeat and despairing of its "Great Idea", may reach a new era of commercial success and literary and artistic production which will no longer provoke scornful comparison with ancient times.

A. H. LYBYER.

*Cavour*. By MAURICE PALÉOLOGUE, translated by IAN F. D. MORROW and MURIEL M. MORROW. (New York: Harper and Brothers; London: E. Benn. 1927. Pp. 307. 10 s. 6 d.)

It is a poor service which the translators of this important volume have rendered the author in the introduction, representing this life of Cavour as, with one unnamed exception, "the first in which an attempt has been made to portray the lineaments of the man as well as the statesman". To valorize Paléologue's *Cavour* by ignoring the existence, or misrepresenting the character, of such important biographies as those by William de La Rive, Countess Martinengo Cesaresco, William Roscoe Thayer, Paul Matter, and others, is an injustice which reacts against Paléologue. One is led to expect too much.

The author himself knew his own limitations and in his preface characterized the volume as a "simple sketch". As such it possesses real value. It offers a striking and, in its broad outlines, a faithful portrait of the master statesman of Italy, drawn with the skilled hand of an artist. But if the canvas is examined too closely, it is found to contain many defects. In reality it is a simple sketch.

On the first page appears the statement that "the creator of United Italy never saw with his own eyes Parma or Bologna, Venice or Rome or Naples". The truth, however, is that Cavour in his published diary recounts a visit of several days in Venice, that his presence with the

king in Bologna in May, 1860, was the occasion of a great popular demonstration, and that he journeyed through Parma on that same visit to Bologna. In search of dramatic effect it is easy for a rapid writer to fall into errors of fact much more grave than this, which actually distort the "lineaments" of his character. Thus in describing the fateful, clandestine meeting of Cavour with Napoleon III. at Plombières in 1858, Paléologue states that when the emperor declared that France would be ready to support Piedmont in a war against Austria, provided that a suitable *casus belli* could be found, Cavour, "surprised by the audacity no less than the unexpectedness of such a question, which surpassed all his fondest hopes, was visibly disconcerted and stammered a reply". But as a matter of fact Cavour went to Plombières well knowing that the *casus belli* was the leading difficulty and he actually had a memorandum on it ready in his pocket. To represent him as unprepared is to do injustice to his foresight and altogether underestimate his diplomatic ability, which the author in other pages eulogizes as supreme.

In his account of Cavour's famous love affair with Marchesa Anna Giustiniani, Paléologue confuses several of the incidents, but his vital error is in stating that Cavour "suddenly disappeared", whereas in reality it was the lady who had been obliged to disappear with her husband. It is true that Cavour was not faithful to her, but it is also true that he knew, what Paléologue does not know, that previously she had been unfaithful to him. It is not true that he gave her "the pseudonym of *l'Incognita*" in his diary; the pseudonym was invented by his biographer Domenico Berti a quarter of a century after his death.

But the broad lines of the Cavour portrait are drawn with a more certain hand. The narrative proceeds dramatically and the estimates of the Italian's astounding diplomatic achievements are generally sound, and in their interest and felicity of expression are second to none that have been written. It was the union in Cavour of faculties generally incompatible that gave him unique power: "daring with prudence; impetuous driving power with charming persuasiveness; methodical calculation with intuitive anticipation; keen intellect with potent inspiration; vivid imagination with cold reason. In the supreme hierarchy of statesmen none transcends him." It is a French diplomat who writes this.

In his sketch of Napoleon III., Paléologue is at his best. He writes without bitterness and without compassion. At times one is tempted to ask whether he did not choose Cavour as a subject in order to expose the weakness of the French emperor. That Napoleon III. personally, without the advice of his ministers, negotiated the alliance with little Piedmont, "in which he staked nothing less than the future of France and all the fruits of years of political endeavor—this it is that has earned him the condemnation of History". Cavour and the unification of Italy, Paléologue would say, spelled the ruin of the empire.

The volume first appeared in French as a serial in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* from October 15, 1925, to April 15, 1926; then as a French

volume published by Plon in 1926; now in this English translation without revision, and hence without profiting by the recently published Cavour-Nigra Correspondence (Bologna, Nicola Zanichelli).

H. NELSON GAY.

*Karl Marx's Interpretation of History.* By MANDELL M. BOBER, Associate Professor of Economics in Lawrence College. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. XXXI.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 370. \$3.50.)

IN this book Dr. Bober has placed students of the social sciences under a very definite obligation. While other writers have approached the subject with objectives similar to his, their work has either been arbitrarily limited in focus, as in the case of Seligman, Croce, and Veblen; or has been written in the spirit of discipleship, as witness Labriola, Sombart, and Boudin. In nearly all, the emotional impact of Marx or of the movement which bears his name has inhibited breadth and objectivity of treatment. Dr. Bober writes with detachment, though not without appreciation.

The organization of the book is simple and effective. Two-thirds of it are devoted to the effort to determine precisely what Marx wanted to say. What, it is asked, did he have in mind when he employed certain concepts associated with the materialistic interpretation of history? What did he mean by "conditions of production", "forms of production", "organization of production", and all the other relatively undefined terms which support the superstructure of his theory? To what did he ascribe change in society—to the invention of the instruments of production, or to the invention of new forms of organization? What is the Marxian conception of human nature? To what does Marx ascribe the origin of institutions, religion, science, capitalism, art? Led by these and similar queries Bober has undertaken the three-fold task: of discussing interpreters of Marx's interpretation; of interpreting Marx's interpretation anew; and, lastly, of evaluating the doctrine as a theory of history.

Of the aims which Dr. Bober has set before himself, the first two have been realized with scholarly ability and good judgment. It would be difficult to find a more even-handed analysis in the literature of the social sciences. There is room here for strong commendation, if not even for enthusiasm. The last, and more critical section of the book, however, gives one the impression that the author's keenness is somewhat dulled. His final judgment of the economic interpretation of history is formulated, ambiguously, by saying that it will "shed light on many historical phenomena, but it will be inadequate to interpret history", that it is "a key that fits many locks but opens few doors". This impotence of the theory as a scientific tool in the study of man, Dr. Bober explains in well-known and controversial terms. He revives the old debate between the materialist and the spiritual interpretations of history. Marx is again reproached for being too unyielding in his insistence upon a

monistic theory of social evolution; and for having failed to ascribe sufficient weight to non-economic agencies in the life of man. Dr. Bober tests Marx's theory by an appeal to the general facts of history. Does, he asks, the mode of production account for all human activities and interests: art, science, religion, as well as property, law, and morals? No, it does not. Do Marxian stages of social evolution conform with what we know of the past in all areas? No, they do not. Evidently, then, a new theory of human progress would seem to be in order, and Dr. Bober suggests that it should be less simple, and lean more heavily, perhaps, upon the recent findings of geography, anthropology, and psychology.

What is indeed remarkable in Dr. Bober's book is the fact that nowhere does he question the underlying assumptions of Marx, which are identical with the assumptions of historical thought for at least two centuries. He does not question the view that history is unitary; that change is characteristic of human societies; that when change occurs it is slow, gradual, and continuous; that change is due to "the persistent desire to improve what is"; that the comparative method may be invoked with confidence. It would seem, however, that a critical study of social evolution according to Marx might profitably begin with a discussion of these preconceptions, upon which his imposing structure ultimately rests.

F. J. T.

*The Idea of Social Justice: a Study of Legislation and Administration and of the Labour Movement in England and France between 1900 and 1926.* By CHARLES W. PIPKIN, Associate Professor of Government in the Louisiana State University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xvi, 595. \$3.50.)

THIS is an essay in political ethics developed against the background of labor legislation in England and France and the political and industrial organization of labor in those countries since 1900. It was undertaken while the author was under appointment as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford. He defines his project as an attempt "to estimate the strength of certain forces at work in England and France which are helping to create a better order for the individual".

The modesty of the author, coupled with the ambition which prompted this task, is disarming. His equipment is an extended study of documents, chiefly parliamentary debates and reports of trade union and socialist and labor party congresses. He starts out from assumptions for which Aristotle may be in part responsible. For example: the "will for the common good is essentially the will of good men constantly expressing itself in the demand for justice through political organization". "Social justice, it is taken, must finally depend on the expansion of the democratic idea." Progress, for which it is assumed some definite direction has been marked out, was diverted by the World War, but now that the war is well over, it is plain to see that "progress has come back to its old course".

The author's concern for progress in the modern industrial world is in the potential use of political power by economic-interest groups. "So it has become important in this century to make industrial organization a means of social justice, which can not be done if groups' rights are considered distinct from the rights of the community as a whole." Any capture of the political apparatus by an economic-interest group is therefore to be deplored while the best evidence of progress in England and France is looked for in the machinery by which these states have tried to secure the coöperation of organizations of employers and employees in the actual administration of the laws enacted for the well-being of the common life.

The surveys of labor history and social legislation in England and France, to which the major part of the volume is devoted, leave so much to be desired in clearness of outline that they are easily confusing to the reader who does not know the landmarks well already. It would be difficult, for instance, to derive an idea of even the general provisions made by England in any one of the fields of social legislation from the two chapters under that title.

An impression may be obtained to the effect that the development of labor legislation and trade-union organization proceeded apace in England and France and followed models not dissimilar (as for instance from p. 294). The contrary is the case. Indeed, the sharp contrasts in chronology and constitutional pattern which belong to the two countries have real pertinence for the central theme of the essay and call for interpretation. These contrasts, which such a parallel study as this should make available, constitute one of the most fruitful opportunities for the exploration of the Idea of Social Justice.

The continuity and general effectiveness of the theme of the essay is seriously interfered with by resorting to the use of extended quotations and by the device of inserting them in the body of the text in the same type and without indentation. The real trends of the movements are, after all, seldom found in parliamentary debates and presidential addresses. Having rejected a pluralistic state, the author seeks not so much separate currents of influence but rather the "purpose of the government" or "the spirit expressed in the passing of an act". He seldom goes beyond the administrative structure he may be describing to give any hint as to how it has actually functioned.

Much of the discussion assumes the reader possessed of fairly detailed information. The *conseils de prud'hommes* are a "peculiarly French institution", we are told in a section with their name for a caption, but their function may be concerned with the pasteurization of milk, so far as any hint of it is contained in the text. The references to central bodies of workers are sometimes so indefinite as to leave some question as to identification. It may be that faulty proof-reading accounts for the fact that only once (p. 361), so far as discovered, is the British Trades Union Congress alluded to by its real name. In the

chapter, Some Political Aspects of the French Labour Movement, the "Paris Congress of 1899" is introduced and discussed with no chance given for finding out what constituent bodies it represented.

If one is convinced, as the reviewer is, that the "idea of social justice" can be invested with meaning from a comparative study of the varied political and industrial experience of different states, one desires to welcome every contribution to this field of scholarship. For this reason one regrets that the author in the present case has covered so much ground with almost no use of the comparative method to which his choice of material almost commits him. It partly accounts for the fact that the conclusion is a general abstract discussion which might easily have been written if the study had not been made.

AMY HEWES.

*The Miracles of Versailles.* By HERMANN STEGEMANN, translated by R. T. CLARK. (New York: A. A. Knopf. 1928. Pp. 360. \$5.00.)

THE purpose of this book is to demonstrate the necessity of revising the European settlement of 1919 in favor of the defeated states, not so much because of the injustice done them at Versailles, as because that settlement was in accord neither with "the laws of geography" nor "the continuity of history", and therefore can offer no basis for permanent peace. "The Treaty of Versailles enshrines an irrational political idea. . . . The security and peace of Europe depend not on the maintenance but on the demolition of the wall of encirclement built around Germany, not on the security pacts, but on the restoration of sovereignty to the German people and the violated nations. . . ." Although the author does not sketch an ideal European system, it is plain that he believes that stability depends upon the incorporation of Austria within the Reich and the close coöperation politically of the secession states, Greece and Turkey, with Germany.

His method of demonstration is to present the historical background of eighteen territorial areas in Europe corresponding to existing states, attempting to evaluate the forces which have made them and are likely to operate in the future. He extends his survey back to the political origin of each state, with an emphasis upon strategic factors which makes of the book essentially a study in strategy, for the influence of which as a vital, if not dominating, force in history he has great respect. Mr. Stegemann has skill in synthesis and the sketches of the individual states, once his rather narrow outlook has been accepted, are stimulating. They would carry more interest and authority if they were accompanied by a definition of the laws of strategy and of geography upon which he lays such stress. In what sense does he mean that Bohemia sins against those laws by accepting the assistance of France, and what is the process by which the "geo-political" aims of Tsarist Russia began to control the policy of the Soviets after the death of Lenin? In dealing with contem-

porary issues the author weakens confidence in his conclusions by a display of rather obvious bias. Thus the Germans are apparently justified in their invasion of Belgium because they obeyed the "law of strategy"; but "the Czechs were the passionate instigators of trouble. When the World War broke out, they broke loose from the Dual Monarchy". The vices of the Versailles settlement, Mr. Stegemann believes, are due to the weakness of Wilson, who betrayed the trust placed in him by the defeated nations, and the machinations of France, whose sinister hand he finds accountable for every recent misfortune of Europe. His interpretation of the Peace Conference is based upon the conviction that the Big Four of Paris were "dictators", responsible for creating chaos from which no order could be evolved; they "broke Austria-Hungary in pieces" to make a French military way of the Danube, showing "clearly the egoism of French policy"; they "did what they could to stimulate" the ambitions of Poland; "Woodrow Wilson and the Western Powers" put "German lands up for auction"; the Czechoslovak state "was constructed by France according to strategic laws". American readers will find amusing the statement that the "United States had fought for Britain in the World War, for they were summoned by a fellow-feeling for 'the old country'". It is also surprising, if we are mindful of Wilson's efforts at Paris in January, 1918, to read that "in the coupling of the League Covenant with the Peace Treaty was revealed the triumph of Anglo-French policy over the doctrinaire Americanism of Wilson".

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

*The League of Nations: a Chapter in World Politics.* By JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, Ph.D., LL.D. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1928. Pp. xii, 415. \$3.50.)

THE last of Professor Bassett's books maintains the high standard of his earlier works. It is a popular account, chiefly of the various "crises" encountered at Geneva during the first seven years of activities under the Covenant. It is one of the most readable of the many books published in recent years concerning the work of the League of Nations. The writer presents the League of Nations in a somewhat conventional way, and omits the consideration of many of its activities. The facts are garnered from the official minutes of various conferences, and are presented without any attempt to fill the lacunae of official records from the rich literature which is available. The result is a fair-minded and objective though incomplete summary of the more exciting "political" tangles of seven years, with little emphasis on the cumulating achievements in international coöperation. The book lays some foundation for a general understanding of the Geneva experiment, but it indicates little appreciation of the new conditions which have changed the character of world politics.

The chapters on the machinery and technique of the League are formal and inadequate. The author shows little appreciation of the im-

plications of the requirement of unanimity. He was much troubled about the relative powers of the Assembly and the Council, and the lack of a clear-cut allocation of power between the two bodies seems to have disappointed his sense of constitutional housekeeping. He found it strange, for instance, that the Council should have considered its competence to extend to making arrangements for the meeting of the First Assembly, and he exaggerated "the discontent of the Second Assembly" (ch. VII.). In company with many other commentators, in reading Article 23 of the Covenant, he neglects the qualification contained in the introductory clause. Unfortunately the work of various organs of the League in connection with international legislation, which is perhaps the most important contribution of these years, is wholly omitted from the author's picture. The International Labour Organization is barely mentioned, and the reference to a possibility that it might bring "wages throughout the world to a common standard" (p. 22) indicates a failure to appreciate its functions. The Transit and Communications Organization is similarly neglected. The Permanent Court of International Justice is not given its precise place in the picture of international organization, and the statement of the effect of the United States Senate's reservations in connection with the proposed adhesion to the Protocol by the United States is not adequate.

The accounts of various political questions before the Council are readable and understanding. The adverse criticism of the rôle played by the Council in connection with the plebiscite in Eupen and Malmedy is deserved, though the author might have considered more fully the limitations placed on the Council's action by the Treaty of Versailles; instead of saying that the applicable provisions in the Treaty of Versailles were "clumsily written", it would have been truer to say that they were "artfully written". The threads of the Aaland Islands difficulty, and of the disputes about Vilna, Memel, and the Vilayet of Mosul, are traced in such a way as to give both interest and usefulness to the volume. In the reviewer's opinion, the conclusions as to the settlement of the Corfu affair neglect the psychological influence of the Council's action. The history of the Geneva Protocol, the Locarno Treaties and Germany's admission to membership of the League of Nations is adequately presented, though at times the author shows a disposition to regard Western European opinion as world opinion.

Professor Bassett's conception of the League of Nations was that of a conference of foreign ministers dealing with major political problems. His comparison of the League of Nations and the Castlereagh plan "for calling together the Foreign Secretaries of Europe to adopt common policy" (p. 375) is very interesting. But he found that "there is growing up a League entity, distinct from any State in the League, and with a life of its own". "When the Foreign Ministers, sitting in the Council, do things, it is not the States doing them but the League." Perhaps this conception was the clearer in the author's mind because of the slight

attention given to the process of international legislation through international conference.

The reviewer finds that the volume fails to put the League of Nations into its historical setting. The successful organization of international coöperation before the war is not mentioned. This is the more surprising in view of the clear historian's attitude in writing this study. But it is the sure instinct of the historian that led the author to say that "one of the great facts of the League lies in its ability to outlive the generation of 1914-1919" (p. 386).

A greater attention to detail might have improved the book: the Polish Minorities Treaty was signed on June 28, 1919, and not on June 19 (p. 19); the first meeting of the Council was held on January 16, 1920, not on January 6 (p. 34); the Governing Commission of the Saar Basin does not include a member appointed by Germany (p. 35); the Council did not meet at Geneva on July 9, 1920 (p. 49); Mr. Harding was not President on February 4, 1921 (p. 360). In some places more adequate references ought to have been given for the texts of treaties; for example, the *Annual Register* of 1925 is cited for the texts of the Locarno Treaties, which are published in numerous more reliable collections. But the slight inaccuracies do not mar the usefulness of an informing and interesting study, which ought to reach a wide public.

MANLEY O. HUDSON.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*Thomas Paine, Prophet and Martyr of Democracy.* By MARY AGNES BEST. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. 1927. Pp. xii, 413. \$3.50.)

THE only proper way to evaluate a book of this type is to consider precisely what the author was trying to do. Obviously she was not trying to add to the sum total of our knowledge of Tom Paine, which may now be derived from sources long since printed. This is no study "from the sources", if by the sources one insists upon meaning unpublished manuscript material. Its brief bibliography refers to books to be found in even the smaller public libraries. Paine's own works have been reprinted so often and in so many different forms that to examine all the printed material alone would be the work of a lifetime. The compilation of a bibliography of Tom Paine would be a herculean task, comparable to the making of a bibliography of the various editions of *Robinson Crusoe*. The book is not a detailed, nor a scholarly life of Paine in the sense of Beveridge's *Marshall*, or Monypenny and Buckle's *Disraeli*. It is of the class of the modern biographies written by Strachey, Ludwig, André Maurois, and others, in which the author seems to feel that unless the great characters of history are to be utterly forgotten they have got to be presented to the modern reader in a very different type of biography from that demanded by the scholar.

Having decided to write such a biography, the author, to borrow from her own style, "wades in". While perhaps it is unfortunate that one must "lick the French", that Paine must utter "wisecracks", and that Niles's *Acts of the Revolution* "contains enough patriotic hot air to warm the surface of the globe", still, that appears to be the language which the man in the street understands, even if the scholar objects. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the scholar is going to object to Miss Best's facts, her interpretations, or her conclusions. Admitting that Conway's standard work is a little too pro-Paine, she certainly out-Conways Conway. As to this the scholastic fundamentalists are certainly objecting to Miss Best. Whether this is a merit or a defect in the volume depends entirely upon one's point of view. It may, however, safely be said that in this age of psychology and tabloids, such books as Miss Best's are going to help keep the fathers before the public.

It is fundamentally not a book for the historical specialist. It is not intended for him. He has his Conway, if he wants it. Suffice it to say, then, that it will leave upon the mind of the reader very, very few totally erroneous impressions. Admitting with W. S. Gilbert, that "every boy and every gal born into this world alive, is either a little Liberal or else a little Conservative", there is not much use in entering upon the eternal conflict between Burke and Gouverneur Morris on one side and Tom Paine on the other. If you agree with Paine, is it unlikely that Burke and Morris are going to receive anything but very cavalier treatment—which they do, at the hands of Miss Best?

It is, perhaps, a pity that the author quoted printed documents so extensively when she manifests a very decided ability for summarizing them. The extensive analysis of Paine's writings is interesting, but then, one has the original. On the whole it is a book which deserves serious consideration for collateral reading by undergraduates, and is good for reading in the subway. These two classes of readers have their rights, as well as the scholar.

*The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* By ALICE M. BALDWIN, Assistant Professor of History in Duke University. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1928. Pp. xiv, 222. \$3.50.)

CONTEMPORARY observers were much impressed by the activity of the Puritan clergy in the American Revolution. The Tory, Peter Oliver, spoke of "Mr. Otis's black Regiment, the dissenting Clergy", and newcomers to the American scene were reminded of the politico-religious controversies of the seventeenth century. Recent studies have refreshed our memories and Miss Baldwin's monograph is a welcome addition to this literature.

The second half of the book deals specifically with the Revolutionary era; but the first half gives an excellent account of Puritan political teaching in the earlier eighteenth century. A great mass of pulpit literature has been analyzed, notably the election sermons; and, though there

are risks in piecing together a system from such material, the recurrence of a few fundamental notions is clearly shown. With a legalistic theology, stressing the covenant relation between God and his people, and the covenant idea in church polity, were combined quite naturally the compact theory of the state, the notion of a fundamental law binding upon rulers as well as people, the consequent right to resist measures at variance with this fundamental law. To support this teaching, precepts and analogies were drawn from the scriptures, from classical antiquity, from the Protestant Reformers, from Locke and other modern theorists.

Eighteenth-century New Englanders doubtless had a more secular outlook than their fathers; but Miss Baldwin notes the continuing importance of clerical leadership, especially in the country towns, pointing out also that there was often no sharp distinction between "natural law" and "divine law". As John Barnard said, "This Voice of Nature is the Voice of God". Since church and state were closely related, ecclesiastical controversialists like John Wise, and the later champions of "Old Light" and "New Light", were naturally led to discuss also the sources and limitations of authority in general.

During the last French war, the New England preachers seemed to find in the existing order—the Revolution settlement in England and their own charter governments—a fair approximation to correct principles. They were therefore ardent defenders of "English liberties", civil and religious, against the "Slaves of Lewis". The revenue controversies, however, set them to restating traditional views and applying them to the new situation. How far they were leaders in revolutionary propaganda, and how far convenient instruments, is a question on which Miss Baldwin does not dogmatize. The episcopate controversy is touched lightly, but the activities of such leaders as Mayhew, Chauncy, Cooper, and Jonas Clark are effectively presented.

To the chapter on the "war-work" of the clergy—as chaplains, recruiting agents, etc.—might have been added something on army life from this point of view. There is interesting evidence of ministerial activity in the new governments—in town committees and provincial congresses, and in constitution-making. Independence once decided, most Congregational ministers were doubtless upholders of the "standing order"; but the utterances of such men as Jonas Clark of Lexington and Thomas Allen of Pittsfield show that clerical radicalism on these later issues was not confined to the minority sects.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

*The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy.* Edited by SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS. Volume IV., *John Quincy Adams*, by DEXTER PERKINS; *Henry Clay*, by THEODORE E. BURTON; *Martin Van Buren*, by JOHN SPENCER BASSETT; *Edward Livingston*, by FRANCIS RAWLE; *Louis McLane*, by EUGENE I. McCORMAC; and *John Forsyth*, by EUGENE I. McCORMAC. (New York: A. A. Knopf. 1928. Pp. xx, 392. \$4.00.)

THIS volume contains sketches of six secretaries, serving from 1817 to 1841. Pages 347 to 392 are devoted to satisfactory bibliographical notes for each sketch and an index. The same standards of accuracy and of wide information which were set in the earlier volumes are well maintained. The value of the series as a work of reference becomes increasingly evident. Its disadvantages as a method of presenting American diplomacy are here strikingly evident in the constant division of subjects actually continuous, as that of Texan relations. What can be done by editing to meet this difficulty seems to have been done.

In 111 pages Dexter Perkins deals with the eight years of John Quincy Adams. In importance and variety of subjects dealt with, in legal and logical handling of them, and in abundance of first class source-material, no secretariate equals this, and few have been treated by more and more conflicting historians. Mr. Perkins, therefore, had a task of condensation testing his powers. He has handled it brilliantly. Particularly valuable is his analysis of the problem of the responsibility for decisions reached, so variously divided between strong men. The question of the Monroe Doctrine he discusses with care, and here, as elsewhere, he gives an impression of authority. One regrets that Adams's instructions to Nelson with regard to Cuba are not mentioned, and Adams the expansionist might be more strongly illustrated. One regrets that the sketch of Van Buren repeats the familiar jibe on his change of attitude on Texan annexation, while Adams's change goes as usual without comment.

Henry Clay is treated by Theodore E. Burton in 43 pages. The administration is handled with fine intelligence, and is oriented against a comprehensive background. It seems to the reviewer that the importance of slavery in the Panama debate is overemphasized. Some small errors have crept in. One does not recognize the revolution in Haiti which had been suppressed. Clay, also, is accused of inconsistency on the Texan question, whereas his position was less variable, and more statesmanlike, than that of either Adams or Van Buren.

John Spencer Bassett deals with Martin Van Buren in 43 pages. This sketch varies from the canon in that a much larger proportion of space is given to general politics. This is amply justified by two considerations. First it establishes Van Buren's importance in the determining of diplomatic policy long after he was secretary. Second, his secretariate introduces the period when the office began to be occupied by men with their eyes much more inward than outward. This admirable set-

ting, however, does not detract from a proper attention to Van Buren's small achievements in the field of his office.

Francis Rawle has 56 pages for Edward Livingston's two years' service. He succeeds admirably in setting forth the man. One sees the usual routine questions continuing their course, and the major policies determined by Van Buren and Jackson, but the evidences of an acute and original legal mind are presented, and are of particular interest in the case of the Russian negotiation.

Eugene I. McCormac treats Louis McLane in thirty pages. He performs with grace the task of saying that the subject of his sketch had little influence on foreign policies. He makes compensation by referring to his management of his department; a subject neglected in several of the other treatments when it might have been introduced.

Mr. McCormac has also 42 pages in which to set forth the record of John Forsyth's seven years of office. By a curious error the title of the sketch mentions only his service under Jackson, which might well have occupied the space allotted. The contents, however, indicate that it is the intention to include also his four years under Van Buren. The author is probably justified in leaving Forsyth a vague character, as he has appeared in the pages of history. However insignificant he may have been, six pages a year represent too much condensation. The failure to notice Jackson's message on Mexican claims causes the policy of the administration on the Texan question to appear more spineless than it was. Forsyth had many important questions to treat, questions which he inherited and passed on. One he had which was particularly his own, that of administering our neutral duties on southern and northern borders. This problem deserved a larger proportion of the space than is given it.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*The Training of an American: the Earlier Life and Letters of Walter H. Page.* By BURTON J. HENDRICK. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1928. Pp. xii, 444. \$5.00.)

THIS is the last of the *Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page*, the meteoric statesman-diplomat of the great war. This stout volume treats the first and trying days of a career that was full of trial and tribulation. Mr. Burton Hendrick has had the peculiar responsibility of editing the letters of Page and of making the running biographical comment which is intended to give the whole story something of the appearance of a biography. The work has been done spasmodically. First there appeared *The Life and Letters*, two volumes, in 1922. Next we had one volume of *Letters of Walter Page to Woodrow Wilson*, 1923, and now this last contribution: four volumes in all. The collection, as one runs through its pages, raises the question of incompleteness, of omissions which might change the rating of this marvellous American.

This instalment is more of a biography, however, than any of the others and more than once the author-editor appears a little in the character of a lover of nature, e.g., pages 13 to 14: "The [Page] house sat on a gently rising hill, in the midst of a great grove of oak trees; in the rear stretched for miles the ever-beckoning forest. A country road skirted the front of the yard and a short distance beyond this ran the railway. For several years this remained the only habitation of the region. . . . Life there was pleasant; the sky was intense in its blue, the grass and leaves in their green, . . . an occasional wagon lumbering by, or a wheezy train crawling out of the forest and vanishing into it again, the general feeling that of solitude. And that eternal rustling of the pines."

A lonesome, rural life not without the romantic appeal which has entered so often into the lives of impressionable young folk. Great pine forests, saw-mills, dinky railroad engines dragging logs out of the wilderness, improvident negro workers, and flea-bitten mules were the subjects of daily and nightly conversation, alternating with solemn warnings about everlasting damnation and distressing returns from lumber shipments that barely paid the freight and cost of sales. It was a hard life and young Walter tried early to escape it, now at "old" Trinity College, North Carolina, now at Randolph Macon in Virginia—schools of the most earnest and elemental characters with five or six devoted professors, each drilling Greek and Latin into their wards with the same will and persistence with which Doctor Witherspoon drilled the same languages into James Madison and Nathaniel Macon a hundred years before at Princeton.

From Randolph Macon the road away from North Carolina led to Johns Hopkins where the lank, nervous, eager Page heard Thomas Huxley lecture, and came into association with Daniel Coit Gilman and Basil L. Gildersleeve. It was a fertilizing experience relieved a little by wide reading and especially a study of Randall's dull *Life of Thomas Jefferson*. And like the true wanderer, young Page managed to spend a season in Germany and to make a rather bold guess about the causes of things in the Bismarckian junkerdom. But after all the call of the pines in Wake County lured him back to the bare porch of father Page, the saw-mills operating and the negroes loading lumber on freight cars. He was spoiled for a saw-mill man; and the day of the planter was over. There was a summer school for school teachers at the University of North Carolina and the young "gelehrter" went there to teach. He would have become a college professor but a friendly fate denied him an appointment. Was it all for naught? He turned like many another young man to poetry (p. 122):

#### Song of the Pines

"They hang their harps for the winds to sweep—  
Strung to a soft, low southern tone;  
An ocean of music from mountain to deep  
Waves with the waves of the wind-lone

And low is their song,  
Centuries long,  
The song of the lands that beneath them sleep.  
The fair in their sound are laid to sleep,  
The bones of the brave beneath them rest;  
The hopes of the dead die not, but keep  
In their song a thrill for a younger breast.  
'Tis the tale of her years,  
That the old State hears  
Roaring in music from mountain to deep."

It was 1878. There came a call from a Kentucky academy, and at twenty-three years of age the disciple of Gildersleeve set up as a teacher of English. In a year he had a "nest egg" and he invested it in a weekly paper which was to be published in Louisville and eclipse E. L. Godkin's famous *Nation*. In a little while the venture failed and with a big debt duly fixed upon his young shoulders, Page hurried off to take a poor devil's place on a St. Joseph, Missouri, daily paper. In three months he was managing editor; but the call of the New Orleans Exposition drew him and he set out writing articles as he went. The great dailies of New York and Chicago sent him abundant remittances and before the adventure was over he was "rolling in wealth".

The New York *World* set him up as critic and leader-writer, the career of the great Manton Marble beckoning the young Carolinian. But in a twinkle Joseph Pulitzer took charge of the *World* and Page turned his face sadly once more toward the Southern pine-woods: "As I crossed the Potomac, I was aware that I had forgotten even how sparsely the country was settled: the neglected homes, the cabins about which half-naked negro children played and from which ragged men and women stared at the train; the illkept railway stations where crowds of loafers stood with their hands in their pockets and spat at cracks in the platform, unkempt countrymen, heavy with dyspepsia and malaria." (condensed from p. 161).

It was North Carolina again, the old saw-mill still going, carloads of beautiful lumber leaving every day for vast unprofitable markets of the North. Surely a poor outcome of "old" Trinity, Randolph Macon, and Johns Hopkins! He could not drive a great circular saw: it was too late to set up as a plantation master. He founded the *Raleigh Chronicle*, ominous name, and set up at once as reformer and critic of the poor North Carolinians. It was doubtless a lively sheet, for Josephus Daniels, a youth of eighteen or twenty, bought it, debts and all, while Page hurried again to New York to take charge of *The Forum* which he soon made a little gold mine and, therefore, lost control, having meanwhile drawn Woodrow Wilson to him as a contributor. The next we see of our wandering youth, he is in the seat of Lowell and the master of the *Atlantic* and scandalizing the sacred Saturday Club! Something was sure to come of such a young man.

The war with Spain and the urge of the eternal city on the Hudson drew him, about the turn of the century, into the firm of Doubleday, Page, and Company and to the editorship of the *World's Work*, anything but a muckraker. Here he came into admiring touch with the elder Morgan and published the "Random Recollections" of John D. Rockefeller. He was now an imperialist, a strident nationalist preaching the duty of work and the wisdom of what he called "industrial democracy". During the stirring days of Theodore Roosevelt, he became a welcome guest at White House luncheons, a leader in the Southern educational awakening, and a member of Roosevelt's Country-life Commission. The miracles of that marvellous epoch caught him again; and from Roosevelt he turned to Wilson, lifted from pedagogue to President, who in turn took Page from the printer's office and made him ambassador to Great Britain on the eve of the greatest of all wars—in which position Page suffered a sort of martyrdom for the cause of Great Britain.

This is the story. Mr. Hendrick has told it effectively. The interpretive and connecting narrative is intelligent and sympathetic. Page's work as a reformer in North Carolina and the South was not so important, perhaps, as it is here made to appear. The great work there was done by Aycock, Alderman, and McIver, and many lesser figures. But Page did connect these men with the masters of capital in New York and undoubtedly rendered his section a service in that way. That he ever understood what democracy was may be doubted. He was essentially an imperialist who thought, with Kipling, that the white man is entitled to about everything in the world not already taken. To Page the United States had the mission of "cleaning up" all Latin America; meanwhile he was in such a great hurry to clean up the old South that he often lost touch with its best spirits. His was a stormy career which ended finally with his broken remains being laid away in December, 1918, under the pines of Moore County where the family made its last headquarters, where the Southern winds continue to play their tender requiem.

*Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. 1914 Supplement, The World War.* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1928. Pp. ccx, 862. \$1.75.)

THIS is the first of the volumes supplemental to *Foreign Relations of the United States* which are to contain the diplomatic correspondence of the years 1914 to 1919, inclusive, concerning the World War. It begins with the exchange of letters between Senator Stone and the Secretary of State, January 8 and 20, 1915, in which the latter replies to the charges of American partiality towards the Entente Allies, and which provides a brief review of the conduct of the State Department in maintaining American neutrality during the year 1914; there follow a list of the principal persons mentioned in the correspondence and a list of the papers published, with an excellent résumé of the subject of each. The diplo-

matic correspondence itself begins with a brief section devoted to the negotiations relative to the Bryan cooling-off treaties. Following this section the material has been divided into four parts. Part I., representing about a quarter of the correspondence published, includes the reports of American diplomats abroad upon the outbreak and the spread of the war, as well as the various projects of mediation suggested during the summer and autumn of 1914. Part II., amounting to nearly half of the papers, and part III., amounting to rather less than a quarter, are devoted to the problems arising from neutral rights and neutral duties respectively. Part IV. is concerned with miscellaneous problems; such as the representation of belligerent governments in enemy countries, American activities in regard to prisoners of war, correspondence regarding illegal and inhumane conduct of military operations, negotiations relating to Belgian relief, and the work of the Red Cross. Various of the papers included in this volume have been previously published, but the documents formerly printed in paraphrase are now given in their actual text; furthermore, instead of following the system of *Foreign Affairs*, which groups papers by the countries with which the correspondence took place, Dr. Fuller, who has been chiefly responsible for their selection and arrangement, has classified the documents according to their diplomatic context, for which historical students will be profoundly grateful. The rules laid down for the selection and exclusion of material call for the omission of matters that would tend to embarrass pending negotiations or to destroy confidence reposed in the department or to give needless offense; the omission also of personal opinions, when not accepted by the department, and of needless details. On the other hand, it is guaranteed that there is no alteration of the text, no deletions without adequate indications, and no omission of facts of major importance in reaching a decision. The volume concludes with a serviceable index. Altogether it runs to rather more than eleven hundred pages.

The bringing together of these documents facilitates serious historical study of the problems of neutrality, upon which memoirs and personal correspondence have shed a rather uneven light. Lord Grey's *Twenty-Five Years*, Mr. Hendrick's edition of the Page letters, the books of Ambassador Gerard and Ambassador Whitlock, and the papers of Colonel House have called our attention to the most vexatious of these problems. But they have not indicated adequately their number and variety, and the text of the diplomatic correspondence itself was necessary to an appreciation of the complexity of the issues involved and the intensity of feeling that resulted. The most disturbing of the diplomatic conflicts that troubled the President and the Department of State arose in the succeeding years, during the period that will be covered by later supplements. But these documents provide an introduction to the problems that strained relations between the United States and the Entente Allies almost to the breaking-point: those relating to neutral trade are naturally the most important. Under the heading Neutral Rights, the

following topics of the first significance may be noted, as fully treated in the correspondence: efforts to secure the recognition of the Declaration of London; protests of American firms regarding the difficulties connected with shipments of foodstuffs, copper, cotton, oil, etc., with explanations from the State Department and the Allies; interference by belligerent governments with neutral ships and cargoes; embargoes and restrictions of trade by European neutrals and belligerents; projects of coöperation with other American states for the protection of neutral trade; transfer of merchant ships for the repatriation of Americans and, later, for commercial purposes; the censorship of cables and mails. Under the heading Neutral Duties we may note: the problem of reservists and their transit from Canada across United States territory; the sale and transportation of contraband of war; the treatment of belligerent warships in American ports; the treatment of belligerent armed merchant vessels and of merchant ships supplying belligerent warships; the hovering of belligerent warships outside territorial waters; the control over wireless telegraphy.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

*Bethel to Sharpsburg: a History of North Carolina in the War between the States.* By DANIEL HARVEY HILL. Two volumes. (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission. 1928. Pp. xvi, 436, 457. \$7.50.)

It is to be regretted that Dr. D. H. Hill, son of the distinguished soldier of that name, did not live to finish his work, leaving but two volumes, ending with the first day of the battle of Sharpsburg. Although giving special attention to North Carolina, the general excellence of the work is maintained throughout.

As time goes on it becomes increasingly evident that the Civil War could have been avoided if the conservative majority of our people had made itself felt in days following the election of 1860. It was too late when they were absorbed by the militant minorities of both sides, as usually happens in such cases, and the war cry of one was changed from "abolition of slavery" to "preservation of the Union", while in the other party "States Rights" was superseded by the slogan of "subjugation" and "the safety of the home". By this process the people of our country seem to have found something to fight about for four years.

In the military operations that followed, the sons of North Carolina gave more than her complement of one-sixth of the total white population, and exceeded her second quota by three times the number required. Although their homeland was invaded by the Northern army, and although the last to leave the Union, they furnished thirty-five regiments to the army of Lee in the battles on the Chickahominy.

The South, perhaps unwittingly, selected a trained soldier for president, so that Jefferson Davis was able to select men for high commands

who, if they lived, were able so to continue until the end. The adventures of the North in this respect are among the tragedies of history.

Next to the military leaders perhaps the greatest asset that the Confederacy had was furnished by North Carolina in breaking the blockade of her ports, which was kept up until the capture of Wilmington in 1864. As the South was a purely agricultural country it had at first to rely on foreign trade to obtain almost every manufactured article used by civilized man in peace and war. Mills and factories had to be built, provided with machinery, and worked by competent men. The countries of Europe were eager to exchange their products for those of the South, such as cotton, resin, turpentine, tobacco, and the like.

It is to be regretted that there was enough vandalism committed by the troops who invaded North Carolina to call for an order from General Burnside and to decide Commodore Rowan to require that departing vessels be searched for looted property. The military governor and several Federal officers are on record to the same effect.

Much is said about the large amount of sickness among the troops as if it were a necessary part of military campaigning. It is an old story and history gives examples of whole armies that disappeared probably from this cause. It was our sad experience in the Spanish-American War. We came near eliminating it in 1917 by improved methods of camp sanitation.

The use of verbal orders, confusing letters of instructions prepared by an untrained staff, the lack of accurate maps, guides who were ignorant of their own country, uncertain names of localities, continued as in the days of Napoleon and often disturbed the well-laid plans of Lee.

EBEN SWIFT.

*Essai sur la Mentalité Canadienne-Française.* Par GEORGES VATTIER, Docteur ès-Lettres, Directeur des Établissements de la Mission Laique Française à Salonique. (Paris: Champion, 1928. Pp. iv, 384. 50 fr.)

THE mentality of French Canada is essentially a relative or comparative matter. For purposes of study it can be thrown against a European background and viewed as an oversea variation of a normal French type. Or, it can be regarded as in antagonism to the mentality of English-speaking Canada, defending itself from anglicization in a long, embittered effort to maintain British North America a free field for two races, two languages, and two diverging civilizations. No Canadian historian of either race, bred in the traditional history of the struggle for the survival of French Canada, could discuss the question of the two mentalities without instinctively betraying bias. Consequently it is a relief to have a European scholar try his hand at the French side of the question, particularly a scholar of the French school with a gift for lucid analysis, and without the besetting vice of censoriousness. Twenty-five years almost have elapsed since André Siegfried first made

the mentality of French Canada a subject of interest by the publication of *Le Canada: les Deux Races*. At that epoch the tide of ultramontanism was ebbing perceptibly, and the animosities aroused by the war of the Transvaal were being softened by the new *entente cordiale*. Since then such issues as imperial defense and participation in the last war, the continuation of the dispute over separate schools in Ontario, and above all conscription with its aftermath, have brought race differences in Canadian politics into yet sharper relief. In the midst of the turmoil Professor Vattier came to Canada. A seven-years residence in the Dominion convinced him that to a Frenchman French Canada could become an absorbing study. Manifestations of mentality which for long had been obvious and even commonplace to many presented themselves to him as novel and remarkable; and he has pursued an extensive historical investigation in order to reveal French Canada to French readers. The result is a book which takes a definite place amongst works relating to the history of Canada; in fact as an interpretation of French Canada it stands by itself, with a surer appeal to historical students than Siegfried's more transitory discussion.

According to Professor Vattier—and in this he follows the canonical legend long in vogue—the mentality of French Canada sends its roots deep into the piety and missionary zeal of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Catholic France. As virtually a church colony, its mentality grew more self-consciously and conservatively Catholic as France passed through the age of Voltaire. The cession of 1763 began the challenge to its survival, ending in the otherwise inexplicable division of powers at confederation, which had the effect of legalizing a French Canada. The slow but ultimately proud adoption of British citizenship was facilitated by the alienation of French Canada from the prevailing mind of Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, from French liberalism of 1830 and 1848, and above all from France of the Third Republic. Hence to a modern Frenchman the strange paradox of a loyalty of sentiment to the name and memory of France, combined at the same time with an allegiance of reason and self-interest to British law and government. There is, of course, nothing new in the enunciation of this duality; there is much that is new, however, in Professor Vattier's presentation of it. For he has penetrated with unerring insight the very minds of French-Canadian historians and men of letters. With the single exception of Salone, from whose work on the colonization of New France he quotes largely, he has succeeded in explaining French Canada to Frenchmen through the actual words of the successive leaders of French-Canadian thought. On points of detail Canadian critics would disagree with him. Thus, he seems to have overlooked the influence of the ultramontane revival of the nineteenth century, nor does he appear to be aware of the transatlantic reach of the English Tory reaction followed by the countervailing wave of British liberalism in the 'thirties and 'forties, affecting both French and English Canada alike. When, further, departing from

sound argument, he turns prophet and proclaims the eventual collapse of confederation, to be replaced by the experiment of a French Canada, standing separate and alone, shunning alike the United States, and France, and English Canada, its former federal associate, we feel that he is displaying his own mentality rather than that of the people he is describing. But in general there is no existing work that explains French Canada as well as this. It merits a place in every library of Canadian history.

C. E. FRYER.

*Historia Documentada de San Cristóbal de la Habana en el Siglo XVI. Basada en los Documentos Originales existentes en el Archivo General de Indias en Sevilla.* Por IRENE A. WRIGHT, B.A., F.R.H.S. Two volumes. (Havana: Academia de la Historia de Cuba. 1927. Pp. xxiv, 314, 263.)

In January 1919 the Cuban Academy of History, to commemorate the four-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Havana, offered a prize consisting of a gold medal and \$300 for the best history of the city "during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries". Only two essays were submitted and, although Miss Wright's book deals only with the sixteenth century, it was awarded the prize on November 28, 1919 (not "1927" as stated in the prefatory note), because it alone represented original research. However, it was not until 1924 that the necessary funds for the printing were made available and the work was finally published in 1927.

Miss Wright spent many years in the Archivo General de Indias at Seville, and her narrative, which occupies 179 pages of volume I., is based exclusively upon the unpublished source-material cited in the foot-notes. She also selected—and the *embarras de choix* must have been tantalizing—180 documents which are printed in full with the original spelling: 49 documents in volume I. and 131 in volume II. The first document reprinted is dated March 20, 1538, and Miss Wright tells us that there are relatively few prior to that date, and none at all prior to 1515. Thus she has found none relating to the expeditions of Narváez (1513-1514), nor to the establishment of the city on the south coast of the island (probably July 1514) or to its removal to the present site, then known as Puerto Carenas, in 1519.

The history of Havana in the sixteenth century, like that of other Spanish possessions in the Caribbean, was dominated by two great fears: fear of the French corsairs in the first half of the century, and fear of the English buccaneers in the second. The mother country appears to have been roused to action only when the one or the other danger became imminent. The fortifications of Havana, e.g., La Fuerza, El Morro, and La Punta, owe their existence entirely to a crying need for immediate protection, and no money or men were ever forthcoming except in response to desperate appeals for help. Incidentally we learn that the Spanish population of Havana in 1550 numbered only 70 souls, that its

garrison in 1574 had dropped to only 50 trained soldiers, and that its revenues in 1578 amounted to only 50 ducats! Harassed as they were by enemy raids, or rumors of impending raids, by disease, hunger, and want of comforts, one marvels at the patience with which they reiterated year after year their requests for money, guns, and munitions, and with which they detailed, in voluminous reports to the king, the petty quarrels between officials, or between the latter and the clergy.

Miss Wright's book is not, of course, intended for the general reader, although it may be regretted that so much painstaking labor and detailed information could not be welded into a narrative that would make a wider appeal. But the student of the origins of the Spanish empire in the New World must welcome the publication of so many new documents and will be glad to know that the author proposes to continue her documented history to the end of the seventeenth century.

CORNELIUS VAN H. ENGERT.

*Latin America in World Politics: an Outline Survey.* By J. FRED RIPPY, Ph.D., Professor of History in Duke University. (New York: A. A. Knopf. 1928. Pp. xii, 286. \$4.00.)

PROFESSOR RIPPY draws no artificial line between history and politics. Committed by his title to politics, he fearlessly invades the realm of history and appropriates whatever he finds there suited to his purpose. And much he finds. The first chapter deals with the partition of the New World, the second with the contest for the Mississippi Basin and the Floridas, and the third with the independence movement in Latin America. Then come four other historical chapters, in which the rivalry between Great Britain and the United States in the region of Mexico and Central America is the principal theme. France Aggressive and Critical is the subject of a chapter which contains a brief history of the Maximilian episode, together with some observations on subsequent French policy relating to Latin America in general. German Interests and Activities, from 1870 to the date of writing, the attitude of the European powers toward the Spanish-American War, the Venezuelan Imbroglio of 1902-1903, and the Pan-Hispanic movement, are subjects of other chapters of varying merit. The remaining topics relate to Italy and Japan in Latin America, the participation of the southern republics in recent European affairs, "Yankee hegemony" and its effects, and, finally, current problems of inter-American relations.

None of these subjects will impress the student of Latin-American affairs as altogether novel. They have all been treated in essays and monographs which have appeared from time to time in recent years, among which the writings of Professor Rippy himself are by no means the least important. Broad as the field is, yet the author touches it at many points with the sure hand of the specialist. At other points he takes a hackneyed subject, such as the Venezuelan episode, and, drawing upon new sources, presents it in a surprisingly fresh and interesting way.

Yet, on the whole, the novelty as well as the value of Professor Rippy's work consists in the employment which he makes of old materials. He has managed to give the reader in a single volume some notion of the diverse and conflicting international forces which have played for the past four hundred years on a vast area of the Western Hemisphere. The reciprocal action of the rising Latin-American nationalities on the European and Anglo-American world is not so clearly brought to view. But that no doubt is too much to expect in the present state of research in this field.

The later chapters are the least satisfactory. Here the author seems to write under the depressing effects of a belief that the prevailing sentiment of the younger republics toward the United States is one of hatred—"Yankeeophobia" to use his own term. To prove his point he quotes at length from the bitter denunciations which numerous Latin-American writers in recent years have hurled at the Colossus of the North. He casts nothing into the other side of the balance. He does not introduce as a counterpoise the calm, thoughtful, friendly expressions of other writers of more solid worth; nor does he appeal to the constructive views of statesmen and publicists of still greater weight and influence. What is infinitely more important than quoting mere words of good-will or ill-will, he does not discuss the deeds of inter-American coöperation. He mentions the Pan American Union only once, and then disparagingly. He omits all reference to the international American conferences, and he says nothing of the interesting and varied coöperative activities which have grown out of these conferences. "A great deal of bunkum", he says, "has been written in this country about Pan-Americanism." To this he adds a few remarks intended to show the unreality of this phenomenon, and then dismisses the subject. On the other hand, he devotes to Pan-Hispanism, somewhat ethereal itself, one of the longest chapters in the book. The burden of this chapter, too, is hatred of the United States. And so we have pages of hate. The validity of this emphasis Professor Rippy seems at times to doubt. Indeed, in the last sentence of the last chapter he suggests that much of the ill-will is made in Europe, with the ulterior motive of advancing European interests "at the expense of the United States and of Pan-American harmony".

JOSEPH B. LOCKEY.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*The Stream of History.* By Geoffrey Parsons. (New York and London, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, pp. x, 590, \$5.00.) This book seems to your reviewer by far the best conspectus of the world's history and prehistory that has fallen under his notice. Its compendious character makes it somewhat slow reading for those who may be inclined to differ with the author's statement of facts and their interpretation. This will be especially true of professional readers who will deplore the almost complete lack of bibliographical and other supporting material.

No one can fail to be impressed with the extent and thoroughness of Mr. Parsons's preparation for his task. Though he chooses not to name his authorities one feels sure that his reading has been very wide and well selected. In his preface the author says he "has aimed to tell the whole story of man and his earth and to tell it so swiftly and simply that its essential parts will stand forth in their due relationship unobscured by detail. Condensation and elimination have necessarily been extreme; no major fact, whether of science, or art, of commerce, war, industry or conscience has been intentionally slighted". This purpose has been very fully achieved and a remarkably clear exhibition of the essential unity of the forces which have contributed to the making of the past has been exhibited. It is probable that the lay reader may be somewhat exasperated by the bare mention of many interesting persons and events, but the professional, however widely he may differ with Mr. Parsons's emphasis and interpretation, will find keen delight in this rare opportunity for self-examination in the whole field of history. The strongest quality of the book is the author's recognition of the great variety of motives which have made history, with no yielding to the temptation to accept any one of them as dominant. Politics, religion, economics, geography, etc., are all given their due weight but no more. The prehistoric period especially bristles with unsolved problems, but conflicting views are clearly and fairly presented. The complexities of the Renaissance offer difficulties which are not entirely overcome and the tendency of the author seems to be to underestimate the contributions of this period. Nevertheless the chapter on the Renaissance and the following one on Science and Democracy are exceedingly valuable and illuminating.

Where judgment is usually so well balanced it seems strange to find (pp. 108-111) such extravagant praise of the art of the Cro-Magnons. As another minor defect one wonders why, in the very interesting list of revolutionizing inventions (p. 486), agricultural machinery and the rapid printing press should be omitted. And how can Mr. Parsons feel so sure, speaking of primitive man (p. 122), that "his body was a finer and suppler and stronger thing than any man's today"?

A few unimportant typographical errors have been noted and the lack of bibliography must be regarded as unfortunate.

*Ιστορία τῆς Ελληνικῆς Δημοσίας Οικονομίας.* Υπὸ Α. Μ. Ανδρεάδου. Τόμος Α', Ἀπὸ τῶν Ἡρωικῶν μέχρι τῶν Ἑλληνομακεδονικῶν Χρόνων. (Athens, Tzaka, Delagramatica, and Company, 1928, pp. xvi, 563.) This first volume of an extensive history of Greek public finance from Homeric times to the present, a careful revision of an earlier work, has for its lower limit the age of Demosthenes. After brief discussions of the Homeric state and of Sparta, we find a section dealing with the Greek world in classical times. It contains chapters on the financial structure of the Persian Empire, the finances of the Tyrants, with a criticism of Ure's theories, and the receipts and expenditures of the free city-state.

A final section, nearly half the book, is devoted to a study of Athenian finances. First it shows how the city spent its income, for local security and external defense, for instruction and public works, and for the people. Then it describes under two main heads, "ordinary" and "extraordinary", the various revenues of the state. As extraordinary sources of income, the author lists the Treasure, the trierarchy, and the "eisphora", discussing here Boeckh's conception of the latter. Finally, after comparing Athens with other Greek states, he discusses the extraordinary revenues in their technical and social aspects. He is particularly interested in the consequences of imposing such extraordinary taxes upon the rich.

There are numerous scattered appendixes, and also three indexes compiled by the author's students: (I.) Financial and Economic Terms, (II.) Ancient Names and Authors, and (III.) Modern Authors and their Works. Although the last contains approximately one thousand items, it omits, for example, *Inscriptiones Graecae* and other important collections of inscriptions. The author tends to cite epigraphical studies rather than inscriptions. Many of the bibliographical references are inaccurate, e.g., Bosford. In the text and notes, non-Greek names often suffer metamorphosis. Thus Wilhelm becomes at times Βόλχελμος. In one place I find myself called familiarly & Allen, and elsewhere Meritt and I are named as authors of an article with which we disagree. But such peculiarities have their compensation in the general adequacy of the bibliographical material.

A partial list of Professor Andreades's articles and books, occupying more than a page in the index, and in subject-matter ranging widely in time and space, serves to emphasize his statement that the book was written for students of political economy rather than for professional classicists. The work is important because of the author's point of view and technical competence; and the fact that such a comprehensive study was written by an undoubted authority in public finance makes it unique.

A. B. W.

*Ancient Sicyon, with a Prosopographia Sicyonia.* By Charles Skalet, Ph.D., Professor of Greek and Latin in Concordia College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, no. 3.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1928, pp. iii, 223, \$2.50.) This dissertation was written with the express purpose of investigating "all the material connected with ancient Sicyon" and embodying "the results in a single monograph". The work is exactly what one might expect, a compilation of information about this Greek city. It contains very little that is new, and its value and usefulness are in direct proportion to its completeness.

In the first chapter Professor Skalet describes the situation and topography of Sicyon. There is nothing here to show that he knows the district and its classical remains from personal observation. One infers rather that Professor D. M. Robinson, who read the proofs on the site and provided the sketch map and photographs which are used as illustrations, served as eyes for the author. The second chapter is devoted to the

Sicyonian sources of wealth. A large part of the third chapter, the Heroic Age and the Dorian Ascendancy, is given over to a discussion of the conflicting ancient accounts of the legendary kings of Sicyon and their genealogy. We find here a translation, three pages long, of portions of an article written by Pfister on the Sicyonian sources used by Pausanias. In the next three chapters there is a brief narrative account of the city's history up to Byzantine times. Special chapters are given to Sicyonian sculptors, painters, the Sicyonian treasures at Olympia and Delphi, cults, and a short summary entitled "Sicyonian Civilization", in which the city's contributions to literature are listed. The last chapter contains a prosopographia of 367 items. This is followed by a bibliography and an index. The book is plentifully supplied with foot-notes containing references to ancient and modern writings.

This is not the place in which to note the errors of commission and omission which I have found, particularly in the prosopographia and index. A generalization or two with concrete illustrations must suffice. The monograph is weak in its treatment of Roman Sicyon, partly because of a lack of information in ancient sources, partly because the author had no adequate secondary authority from which to get material on this period. Modern writers, Professor Skalet included, have not examined and compiled all the available evidence. It will be noted that he mentions only one source relating to the descendants of Aratus during the empire, Plutarch's introduction to the life of Aratus. An interesting Delphian inscription (Dittenberger, *Sylloge<sup>a</sup>*, 846) is much more enlightening, for it shows the importance of the family throughout the Roman province of Achaia. It had received Roman citizenship under the Claudian emperors, and members of the family were high-priests and priestesses in the imperial cult (*cf. I. G.*, IV. 399). There are other omissions in the prosopographia, even of names which are mentioned in the text.

One notes at times a readiness to accept modern theories without critical examination. For example, the author accepts as probable an unfounded hypothesis suggested by Hitzig-Blümmer which identifies the Pythocles who dedicated the temple of Apollo and its statue with a sculptor of unknown origin mentioned by Pliny. (The name Pythocles is omitted from the index.) It is much more probable that Pythocles, since he is named as the dedicatory, was a wealthy public-spirited Sicyonian, and as the name Pythocles was used by the family of Aratus in Roman times, it is likely that the temple was dedicated by a descendant of Aratus. Whether he was the Pythocles mentioned by Plutarch must remain uncertain.

This identification is of interest topographically, for Pausanias (II. 7, 9; 8, 1) mentions in rapid succession three monuments, each of which must have been closely associated with the house of Aratus, if Pythocles was a member of it. These monuments were the temple of Apollo, the precinct consecrated to the worship of the Roman emperors, in which cult the family was more than locally prominent, and the *heroum* of Aratus himself.

The book is valuable chiefly because it collects in a convenient form and small compass the results of many studies about Sicyon. Although it is not long, greater compactness would possibly have added to its value. Certainly it would have made the monograph less expensive to print.

A. B. W.

*La Paix Romaine.* Par Eugène Cavaignac, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [Histoire de Monde, ed. E. Cavaignac, V. 1.] (Paris, Boccard, 1928, pp. 492, 30 fr.) Several histories of Rome intended for popular consumption have recently appeared in France, among which one may mention those of Grenier, Piganiol, and Cagnat as serving their specific purposes well. This new volume by Cavaignac does not follow orthodox lines in its arrangement. It begins after the Gracchan revolution, concerning itself almost entirely with the last century of the republic and the beginnings of the empire. There is no attempt to tell a consistent story. After a hurried picture of the Roman world as it was about 121 B.C., a rapid sketch of military movements of the last century before our era introduces the bulk of the volume which is devoted to an extended description of each province. These descriptions reveal some interest in administrative practices and in social and economic conditions, but they are too rambling to be of much service. They are not incisive enough to leave the general reader with a clear impression, and they are not full enough to satisfy the specialist. Cagnat and Toutain have recently attempted similar tasks with far better success, while Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History*—which is not even mentioned though it has been available for two years—antiquated Cavaignac's volume on its appearance.

The book is somewhat irritating. While Cavaignac's interest in fiscal and economic problems has led him to some new points of view, his statistics—as in the case of his *Population et Capital*—are often based upon an incomplete survey of the evidence and vitiated by over-bold guesses. For instance, Mithradates did not kill a hundred thousand Romans in Asia (p. 103), the census figures of Augustus did not include women and children (p. 123), and Cavaignac's estimates of the Asiatic tribute (p. 236) are arrived at by a series of unconvincing calculations. Nor does one find a reliable historical imagination in the frequent attempts at reconstruction. It was hardly worth guessing that Caesar decided to colonize Carthage merely in order to penalize Utica (p. 362). Finally the brief bibliographies teem with misspellings (even of well-known names like Schanz, Hülsen, Rostovtzeff) and reveal a remarkable lack of interest in excellent historical work done outside of France during the last fifteen years.

TENNEY FRANK.

*The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India.* By E. H. Warmington, M.A., Reader in Ancient History in the University of London. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1928, pp.

xii, 417, \$6.00.) With the appearance of this book the curtain of speculation concerning the relations subsisting between imperial Rome and India has been pushed far back, and new light has fallen both on the economic life of the empire and on some of the moot questions regarding the use of the routes to the East in antiquity. Mr. Warmington shows in part I. that the period of Rome's commercial greatness was relatively brief, occupying little more than the first two centuries of the Christian era. Not until then did Rome enjoy direct and extensive intercourse with India, and then only because of two prime factors, namely, the confidence induced by the accomplishment of imperial unity and the fortunate discovery by one Hippalus of the use of the monsoons in the Indian Ocean. This latter made the Red Sea route, as in modern times, the principal commercial artery in the Eastern trade. It appears that at all times the non-Romans of the nearer East were able to retain certain trade secrets, and both before and after the days of Rome's ascendancy they monopolized the Indian trade as middlemen.

The second part of the book begins with an extensive consideration and enumeration of the animal, plant, and mineral products entering into the Eastern trade. Then follows an able analysis of the Roman economic system and the effects of the constantly adverse balance of trade. An interesting conclusion is that although the quantities of goods imported from India during the height of the empire compare not unfavorably with quantities drawn from the East in modern times, no evil economic effects seem to have resulted.

While the work is somewhat marred by idiosyncracies in the way of involved style and old forms of spelling, the author has made a real contribution to our knowledge and understanding of an important period and subject. He has been conscientious in his sifting and researching of ancient documents and has carefully collated the results of his studies with those of other modern scholars. He does not always make clear the reasons for his assertions, but one may suppose that intimate acquaintance with the intrinsic merits of ancient writings has led to his conclusions. No statement has been made carelessly, but one less versed in the relative values of the sources used is likely to feel that rather important conclusions sometimes rest on insufficient evidence. That is particularly true in the extent to which trade conditions have been reconstructed on the basis of occasional discoveries of Roman coins in various parts of India.

Each chapter ends with a brief recapitulation, and the book with a good summary. The notes for the whole are placed at the end of the volume, and, as the chapters are numbered anew in each part, this is inconvenient. One illustration is included, and a very useful map is appended to the text.

HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

*Ibn Saad: Biographien Muhammeds, seiner Gefährten, und der Späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht.* Herausge-

geben von Eduard Sachau. In nine volumes. (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1905-1928.) It is a far cry from the history of these United States to that of the beginnings of Islam, and, perhaps, a farther from the languages used and recognized as academic in the *Review* to the tongue of Arabia, but, if only as a gesture of the catholicity of historical scholarship, it may be in place to record here the completion of the great thesaurus on the life of Muhammad and his companions and immediate successors, which goes under the name of *Ibn Saad*. This is, without question, the greatest primary source for the origins of Muslim history, and, under the guidance of Professor Eduard Sachau of Berlin, has been appearing in its Arabic text during long years of peace and war and again peace. It is now completed with full indexes compiled by Professor Sachau himself. To him in the fullest measure is due the thanks of the world of scholars for the skill, learning, and tenacity with which he has carried through this great undertaking. It is now for the historical students of Islam and of the history of the world to make use of the rich materials here made accessible to them.

D. B. MACDONALD.

*Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole, and Materials for his Biography.* By Hope Emily Allen. [Modern Language Association of America, Monograph Series, vol. III.] (New York, D. C. Heath; London, Oxford University Press, 1927, pp. xvi, 568, \$7.50.) This treatise is the fruit of many years of labor. Over a score of years ago, in 1905, Miss Allen, then in her first year of graduate work at Bryn Mawr, found in Richard Rolle a subject for a seminar report; and later, as a candidate for the doctorate at Radcliffe, she returned to the same field. In 1910 appeared her monograph on the authorship of the *Prick of Conscience*, generally and erroneously ascribed to Rolle. From that time on, the Hermit of Hampole has been the subject of her studies. As its title clearly indicates this volume is a compilation—a critical and scholarly compilation, be it said—for the guidance of students of medieval lore; only incidentally or by inference does Miss Allen give us her own judgment concerning Rolle's place in literary and religious history.

After two introductory chapters dealing with printed editions and principal manuscripts, and a third on the Office of St. Richard Hermit, which is useful for the light that the office may throw on Rolle's life, come six chapters dealing with his authentic works. In these the author performs her main task, which she describes as "determining the canon". After a chapter on Works of Doubtful Authenticity comes a consideration (chaps. XI., XII., XIII.) of works wrongly ascribed to Rolle; which is followed in turn by a list of medieval quotations and references, and an account of early bibliographies. The last chapter, of nearly 100 pages, treats of materials for Rolle's biography. But the end is not yet; appendix, additional notes, and addenda are followed by four indexes.

Miss Allen's method, the character and thoroughness of her work, may be illustrated by taking any one of the chapters dealing with Rolle's work; e.g., chapter VII., "Treatises (Latin)", which is concerned with three treatises that go very explicitly into the details of Rolle's mysticism. After five pages of analysis the author takes each treatise and gives (a) a classified list of printed editions, (b) a list of manuscripts, (c) references and quotations, and (d) a discussion of the evidences of authorship.

It would be a grave injustice to convey the impression that this work is merely an exhaustive bibliography, an example of scholarly technique. The mass of information that Miss Allen has collected, the hints that she throws out, the conjectures in which she indulges, should be of the greatest value to all who are working in such fields as medieval literature, the history of Christian mysticism, or the development of medieval cults. It will be a great pity if so rich a store of material be allowed to lie unemployed.

A. H. SWEET.

*Staatseinheit und Föderalismus im Alten Frankreich und in der Revolution.* Von Hedwig Hintze. (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1928, pp. xxx, 623, M.16.) This volume belongs to a class of historical works, now growing in number, but of which we have had too few in the past, namely, comprehensive and fairly full treatments of large subjects. Students of French history, and especially of the French Revolution, will read with interest and profit this account of the work of the monarchy in unifying France and of the history of provincial institutions, culminating in the struggle between the two groups representing respectively centralization and federation in the Convention. The merit of the book lies in the fact that the writer sees her subject as a whole and does not lose her way in the great maze of facts. As good as it is, it is not the last word on the subject; doubtless the author would be the first to grant this. A work of such wide scope must, of course, rest upon secondary books, for the most part; where a study of the sources has not been made, and the author does not have time to do it himself, the general work will be thin and unsatisfactory. There are places of this kind in the book, especially in the latter part dealing with the provincial estates and the Revolution. Sometimes an important work has been missed, which, if used, would have thrown much light upon some period. For example, I noticed no reference to the very important work of Professor Prentout on the provincial estates in France. The work is based on an extraordinary amount of reading—the notes, relegated to the back of the book, fill 120 large pages—and shows knowledge not only of books and monographs, but of articles in reviews; there is also indication of first-hand study of the evidence with correction of errors and some new points of view. There are weak places in the work due to the fact that no use was made of the French archives. The subject of the formation of the departments,

the question of why the assembly swept aside the provinces and the new provincial assemblies, can not be treated without a study of the archives and of more printed material than seems to have been accessible to the writer. Use is constantly made of the *Archives Parlementaires* instead of the *procès-verbaux* and the newspapers from which the *Archives* were very uncritically compiled.

FRED MORROW FLING.

*La Vraie Figure de Napoléon.* Par Édouard Driault. (Paris, Morancé, 1928, pp. 338.) The name of M. Driault is well known to specialists in Napoleonic history. His monumental *Napoléon et l'Europe* in five volumes received the Gobert prize last year. And so, while it does not bear the customary earmarks of scholarship, this biography rests on many years of research in the period.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to be neutral-minded about Napoleon: among historians Fournier probably approaches the dispassionate attitude more closely than any other. Most writers have felt it incumbent upon themselves either to condemn or to praise the Corsican, while correcting the views of their predecessors. M. Driault betrays his position in the title of his book, which is unfortunate. One is likely to regard with suspicion a volume which professes (and alone?) to portray the "true figure" of an historical character. As a matter of fact, Driault merely attempts to present a rounded picture of Napoleon: he classes previous studies as "petite histoire" in that they treat only particular phases of his life. His method is to follow his hero closely step by step throughout his tempestuous career. A prose epic is the result. At times the swift style and the rush of events befuddle the breathless reader about as thoroughly as Napoleon doubtless did his contemporaries; thus M. Driault succeeds admirably in reviving the spirit of that age. Mention should be made, too, of the numerous campaign maps and reproductions of famous paintings which the book contains.

C. L. LOKKE.

*L'Aventure Saint-Simonienne et les Femmes.* Par Jehan d'Ivray. (Paris, Alcan, 1928, pp. xii, 233, 20 fr.) The July Monarchy in France resembles somewhat our "Fabulous 'Forties", called by Professor Commons "the hot air period of American History". Instead of spiritualism, abolition, and woman's rights, we find in France romanticism, liberal Catholicism, and socialism; movements which give the period a very important place in the intellectual history of the nineteenth century.

The history of French socialism has been written and rewritten. Even the feminine side has been twice handled, once in 1913 by Alensour, and more recently and more thoroughly in *La Femme dans le Socialisme Français* of Madame Thibert. This study of Madame d'Ivray is a very detailed account of the personal relationship of a few women to Père Enfantin, chief apostle of Saint Simon.

The book is based primarily on a mass of correspondence in the Fonds Enfantin at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. We follow the little group of Enfantin's followers, "La Famille", from their first public meetings in 1827 where they discussed questions of marriage and of the economic reorganization of society to the retirement of Enfantin and the men of the group to a sort of monastic existence near Père-Lachaise from which retreat the police ejected them. Nothing daunted, Enfantin led an expedition to Egypt to find the "Mère Messie". Here after years of frightful suffering "La Famille" broke up. It is a pathetic story of the blind devotion of a small group of poor but high-minded working women to the dreams of Enfantin, the perfect *exalté* wrapped securely in the mantle of his own conceit.

The study suffers from the author's apparent unwillingness to give much of the setting in which these women act and think. It shows all the absurdities of Saint Simonism, ignoring the fact that these people of such fantastic personal behavior not only raised many fundamental questions but frequently gave penetrating answers. The work, in briefer form, would make an interesting appendix to one of the general histories of Saint Simonism.

FREDERICK B. ARTZ.

*Learning and Leadership, a Study of the Needs and Possibilities of International Intellectual Co-operation.* By Alfred Zimmern. (London, Oxford University Press, 1928, pp. 111, 5 s.) This is not an historical work but is of importance to every student of history. It was originally written for submission to two Committees of the League of Nations. The author calls attention to the fact that "Other great political ideas have been accepted after generations of intellectual effort and explanation: but, once victorious, they found a world adapted to their influence. Thus the great collective movements we describe as the Reformation, the Renaissance, the French Revolution, like some of the national movements which came to fruition in the late war, had a long and familiar intellectual record before they reached the stage of practical realization. By a strange irony of history exactly the opposite fate has been reserved for the grandest and most difficult of all political ideas"—the League of Nations. "Statesmen must have the courage to make clear to their peoples that the League is not doing, and can not do, the work for which it was created because its intellectual foundations have not yet been laid." To suggest the processes by which these intellectual foundations may be laid is the purpose of this book.

*American Architecture.* By Fiske Kimball. (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1928, pp. 262, \$4.00.) This is a very clear and interesting account of the development here of the art in which Mr. Kimball rightly thinks America has best said its say. It is perhaps somewhat too condensed; the style, while very pleasant, seems almost to hurry the reader along.

There are three divisions: "The Colonies"; "The Republic with the Greek and Gothic Revivals"; "The Present since about 1880".

The chapters on colonial, after the beginnings, glance at the still medieval seventeenth century and take up the little known transition to Georgian which Mr. Kimball thinks began in Philadelphia, a very wise suggestion which perhaps undervalues the English Church and the royal governors in the North. Then comes an excellent but too swift marshalling of the great prerevolutionary buildings, after which the more provincial types are discussed and a chapter, much too short, is given to the work of the French and Spanish colonies.

Under the early republic Mr. Kimball considers the post-colonial and a type he calls more classic—a word he uses in a puzzling way—in which Jefferson seems to him a great leader. He even calls him a great artist and dismisses Peter Harrison as an amateur!

The Greek revival, that curious attempt to make house, bank, and capitol fit into the temple, the author thinks a distinctive American contribution to style. It seems, however, rather overestimated.

After the confusion which attended and followed the Gothic revival the author prepares us for the architecture of the present by explaining the demands which the industrial development after the Civil War made upon the architect and the new materials, iron, steel, and concrete, with which it equipped him.

On this field is fought the battle between function or decorated construction and form or beauty embodied in classic motives adopted for their appearance. The opposing leaders are, on the one hand, Louis Sullivan and, on the other, McKim, Mead, and White. This is followed by the newest tendency away from form and toward function, again with a look toward the latest sky-scraper and the effect of the set-backs required by law. In Manhattan, which he calls the great city of the present, Mr. Kimball sees the beginnings of a style.

The last part of the book, the history since the revivals, is, perhaps, the most important; for many readers, who know something of earlier types, have had no means of analyzing, as is done here, what has been going on around them.

NORMAN M. ISHAM.

*Caleb Heathcote, Gentleman Colonist: the Story of a Career in the Province of New York, 1692-1721.* By Dixon Ryan Fox. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926, pp. viii, 301, \$3.00.) This biographical sketch was intended partly for students of American colonial history, partly for a wider audience: hence, no doubt, the form in which it is cast. In Caleb Heathcote, Professor Fox sees an excellent concrete illustration of the working of certain colonial institutions, a symbol of certain movements in the life of the British Empire. Herein lies the significance of this book. Others have given us institutional studies in abundance, others have traced this or that movement in colonial or imperial history. What

has been hitherto lacking is something to make vivid, personal, and concrete what has been known hitherto chiefly in the general and the abstract, and Professor Fox has happily begun the task of supplying that lack.

For such treatment the career of Heathcote is admirably adapted. He was a successful merchant and land-speculator. He held many offices, local and provincial, and had some part in the political controversies of his time. Thus the author has an opportunity to explain certain phases of the political and economic development of colonial New York. The principal criticism which the reviewer has to offer is that so little space, relatively, has been devoted to these phases of his career. But, as the author points out, Heathcote was more than a typical provincial aristocrat. He was a representative of "the imperialist mind and the spirit of English civilization in America". He was greatly interested in the production of naval stores, that project so dear to the heart of the British mercantilist and administrator. He served as surveyor-general of customs for the northern district and was appointed judge of vice-admiralty. But his unique contribution to the life of his time was his vigorous promotion of the interests of the Anglican Church in America. "As an Anglican, even more than as an official or a manor lord, he represents the stiff persistence of old English ideals, even when transplanted to a wilderness." The missionary zeal with which he went about establishing Anglican churches in indifferent New York and Puritan Connecticut may have been more characteristic of America than of England, but it was the Englishman's church he was establishing. "the decentest if not the only road to heaven".

A dozen more such biographies, especially if written in a style as pleasing as is this, would do much to remove from American colonial history that stigma of dullness which, it is to be feared, at present rests upon it in the minds of the generality.

A. H. BUFFINTON.

*Virginia and the French and Indian War.* By Hayes Baker-Crothers, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Maryland. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1928, pp. x, 179, \$2.00.) This little volume deals with the part played by Virginia, and to a lesser extent by Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the Carolinas, in the French and Indian War. There is much that is familiar—the reluctance of the colonists to support the war, the quarrels of governors and assemblies, the niggardly appropriations, the difficulty of enlisting troops, the intercolonial jealousies, the plague of paper money. But there is also much that constitutes a real contribution to colonial history. For the first time we grasp the importance of the fur trade of the Ohio region—to what extent it was a factor in bringing on the war, how it drew the Indians into alliance with one side or the other, how it contributed to Braddock's defeat by alienating the Cherokees, how it caused fierce controversies between South Carolina and Virginia, made coöperation by the colonies difficult, and actually influenced the selection of the route to Fort Duquesne.

Unfortunately Professor Baker-Crothers has placed too much emphasis on the indifference of the Virginia people to the French occupation of the Ohio Valley. It is true, as he says, that the average planter did not feel the need of more land for settlement, and was not interested in the Indian trade. But no intelligent man could have failed to grasp the meaning of the chain which France was forging back of the colonies. We know that this had been discussed in Virginia at the opening of the eighteenth century. In 1735 William Byrd II. had pointed out the danger that the French might "build forts to command the passes thro' the said mountains", not only "to secure their own traffic and settlements westward, but also to invade the British colonies from thence". Dinwiddie's exposition of the situation was clear and convincing.

The assembly refused to support the governor because he had trespassed on its control of the purse with his pistole fee. To Dinwiddie this matter may have seemed insignificant, to the Virginians it was vital, for they were no more inclined to submit to taxation by the governor in 1754 than by Parliament in 1765. In other words, they subordinated safety to liberty, by conditioning support for Dinwiddie's Ohio policy upon his renunciation of the fee.

The book is well organized, the points clearly presented, the errors few and unimportant. A serious defect is the omission of even cursory descriptions of most of the military campaigns. This makes parts of the book unintelligible for the reader who is unacquainted with Braddock's defeat or the campaigns in the north. Professor Baker-Crothers has given us a thorough and valuable bit of work, and his main points, although perhaps stressed too greatly, are important and well taken.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER.

*Official Letters of the Governors of Virginia.* Volume II., *Letters of Thomas Jefferson.* Edited by H. R. McIlwaine. (Richmond, Virginia State Library, 1928, pp. ix, 567, \$5.00.) This volume of the series, which covers the period of Jefferson's two terms as governor, June 1, 1779, to June 3, 1781, bulks larger than its predecessor by more than one-third; and were all of Jefferson's official letters available no doubt it would have required two stout volumes to contain them. For the first year and a half however only one letter-book (July 27 to September 18, 1780), which is in the British Museum, has come to light. Of course many of the letters to Virginia officials found their way in due course to the state archives (a good many of them were actually written on the backs of the letters to which the governor was replying), and numerous others of the letters have been preserved. Still there are gaps in the record of executive action, and, as in the preceding volume, these gaps have in a measure been filled by means of proceedings of the House of Delegates, of the Council, of the Board of Trade, and from other sources. Even so the materials for the last six months (there are a few letters of December 24 and 25, 1780, in the letter-book) occupy more than half the volume.

Not quite all the letters were written by Jefferson, for, inasmuch as in the absence of the governor the lieutenant-governor was the head of the state, during such occasional brief periods the executive correspondence was conducted by that official (in one instance John Page, in another Dudley Digges).

It is in the plan of this series to include every official letter of the governor that can be found, and the editor has combed all known sources, both printed and manuscript. It appears to have been the practice to use the letter-book text, when there is such; but in the judgment of this reviewer it would have been better to make use of the letter sent, whenever that was available, unless in special cases, as, for instance, when the same letter was sent to different people.

The editor's task has been performed in a commendable manner, the notes for the most part being just what is needed for clarification. Most readers nevertheless will probably wish that there had been rather more than fewer of those useful brief biographical notes; for of the numerous people who pass in review about one-fourth of them remain unidentified; even the index does not reveal their first names. This reviewer is well aware how much of a problem it often is to fix these identifications; nevertheless an appreciable proportion of the names would seem to offer no serious difficulties. Improper spellings of names are for the most part corrected in the index, but a few such errors are preserved there. One evident error in a date is probably due to the slip of a finger on the typewriter. February 8, 1781 (p. 324, n.), should doubtless be February 7. One typographical defect is particularly noticeable in the volume before the reviewer; many types, particularly in the foot-notes, have failed to print.

E. C. B.

*Fort Wayne, Gateway of the West, 1802-1813: Garrison Orderly Books, Indian Agency Account Book.* Edited by Bert J. Griswold. [Indiana Historical Collections, XV.] (Indianapolis, Historical Bureau of the Indiana Library and Historical Department, 1927, pp. xii, 690, \$2.50.) From 1794 to 1814, Fort Wayne was one of the most important forts and Indian agencies in the United States. The orderly books of its commandants from 1802 to 1813 constitute pages 87 to 405 of this volume. Like most orderly books, they are somewhat disappointing in their historical contents. Daily passwords and countersigns of little significance and accounts of petty court martials are given; but there is no mention of the important Indian land purchase made by William Henry Harrison at Fort Wayne in 1809, nor of his important Indian conference in 1811—the proceedings of which were printed by H. W. Beckwith in 1883. Except for the very excellent editing one might read the orders for November 16, 1811, and never know that the important battle of Tippecanoe had been fought. Contemporary society is not pictured as excellently as it is in Henry Hay's *Journal from Detroit to the Miami River in 1709*, printed

in volume seven. Still, carefully selected omissions would probably have been inadvisable. The military or social historian will be interested in the military punishments described. Until 1812, when Congress prohibited it, these often consisted of from 10 to 100 lashes on the bare back, administered before the troops on parade; after 1812, riding the spiked wooden horse or walking for hours on the parade ground wearing a yoke or wooden collar was often substituted. And yet, when in 1812 Fort Wayne was besieged by an overwhelming force and its commandant was almost continually intoxicated, this handful of hard-drinking, insubordinate troops held their post until relieved.

Pages 405 to 663 are devoted to the account-books of John Johnson, who from 1802 to 1811 ably conducted the very important Indian trading house of the federal government at Fort Wayne. Thousands of dollars' worth of skins and furs were shipped to New York, and, in return, a great variety of goods was received from the "Principal Agent for Indian Factories" in Philadelphia. Large land purchases greatly increased the goods distributed. The invoices, inventories, and memoranda printed will be valuable to the one who some day may write a much desired, adequate description of the federal government's system of factories which were established by Congress upon Washington's recommendation, or a much needed scholarly one-volume synthesis of Indian trade and land affairs.

The scholarly introduction of 87 pages could perhaps have been shortened to forty pages since Griswold's comprehensive *History of Fort Wayne* is available. Appropriate maps, illustrations, facsimiles, and an adequate index are included. Mr. Griswold died before the volume was completed; part of the credit for the excellent editorial work is therefore due to the director of the historical bureau and his staff.

A. T. VOLWILER.

*Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement.* By Frederic Bancroft. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1928, pp. vi, 199, \$2.00.) Anyone who has taken special interest in the sectional period of American history has great regard for Mr. Bancroft's important contribution to this bewildering subject. But, as to this latest work of his, one is puzzled to see just what has inspired it. The chapters read like lectures for a popular audience. Their content is the familiar story as seen from what might be called the point of view of the Whig tradition. Such interpretation as has been added to the bare facts is in accord with that tradition. Today a good many people, not special pleaders, feel impelled to disagree. There are new interpretations which some of us had hoped Mr. Bancroft had admitted to his thoughts. But, of course, he is within his rights in turning his back on views that are still controversial. There is one point, however, that seems to the reviewer to be outside the limits of impressionism. Mr. Bancroft holds the old Northern idea that Calhoun was once a nationalist. The only mode of demonstrating this, except through dogmatic assertion, is by assuming that given words have always,

in all connections, the same meaning that they have for the present speaker. To interpret any man's words without encompassing them by his personality is to put one's self out of court as a critic of men. Because the young Calhoun, without a thought except of getting his own way, denounced the disunionists of 1812, it does not follow that he was a "nationalist" in the Hamiltonian sense. He was a rash young man who had not as yet begun to measure the significance of his own impulses, who was willing to seize any club with which to hit his enemies. Calhoun the political philosopher was not yet born. It is also fair to insist that Mr. Bancroft's last chapter is too dogmatic for true history. His reasoning, summing up the episode, is underlaid by the legalistic temper. Here is an echo of the school of the old Constitutionalists. He seems oblivious to all speculations that question the power of any convention—as of 1787—or any popular vote, to create a nation, disregarding the fact that in America it was necessary to have a terrible civil war to settle the matter.

N. W. S.

*History of the Willamette Valley, Oregon.* By Robert Carlton Clark, Ph.D. (Chicago, S. J. Clarke Company, 1927, pp. 888, \$45.00 for the set, which includes several volumes of biography.) First impressions of this work are that it is one more popular compilation, local in character, and designed merely to be sold by canvassers among an uncritical local constituency. Its format, type, binding, paper, size, hundreds of illustrations (largely without significance except in personal relation to possible purchasers)—all contribute to a depreciating estimate of the book. Multiplication of personal details and petty topics in later chapters have the same tendency.

More careful examination reveals some merits entitling the book to serious consideration and appreciation. The author has written what is in effect a history of Oregon in its earlier pioneer period. Extensive and scholarly use has been made of source-materials, travels, diaries, documents, newspapers, as well as a mass of monographic studies. Many considerable quotations from contemporary sources are given. An appendix prints for the first time documents of great value for the history of Oregon between 1843 and 1846, these having been obtained from archives of the British Foreign Office. Here also are reprinted extracts from the *Aberdeen Correspondence*, which was privately printed in 1885.

Beginning with two chapters on geography and Indians of the Willamette Valley, Professor Clark devotes six chapters to general exploration and fur trade of the Oregon Country as a background of actual occupation of the valley. Problems of the establishment of provisional government, of boundary adjustments, of territorial status, require three chapters. Description of pioneer life is based on source-materials and makes a very interesting contribution. Five chapters are devoted to economic phases of life and progress, partly of the Willamette Valley but largely of the state as a whole, including statistics of very recent developments.

Marion County is made the subject of special chapters with a wealth of detail which is not given for any other county in the valley. Schools, colleges, and churches have their early history recorded with painstaking care. A sketchy and unsatisfactory chapter on politics since 1860 includes an account of the woman-suffrage movement centring on the leadership of Abigail Scott Duniway.

There is an incomplete index, and the use of foot-notes is made an excuse for the omission of a bibliography. Proof-reading is occasionally defective. Photographs of Judge Deady and Henry Villard are confused (pp. 414, 518, 640).

With so much scholarly effort as has gone into this book it is regrettable that so many shortcomings have to be noted by a reviewer. One wonders if the limitations of a publication primarily commercial were unavoidable.

C. A. D.

*Esquisse Historique de la Colonisation de la Province de Québec, 1608-1925.* Par Georges Vattier, Docteur ès-Lettres, Directeur des Établissements de la Mission Laique Française à Salonique. (Paris, Champion, 1928, pp. viii, 128, 30 fr.) It would be difficult to say just when the colonization of Quebec begins to lose its purely historical interest and becomes an activity, subsidized and fostered by the provincial government through a special bureau. Professor Vattier has merged the two phases of the subject into one by viewing the duties of the present ministry of colonization in the light of all that has been done to people New France and Quebec since the days of Champlain and Cartier. This long retrospect, sketched necessarily in the briefest way, is introduced to account for the obstacles that French-Canadian colonization in Quebec has had to face: notably, the disadvantages of the old seigniorial system of land-tenure in spreading population, the neglect of road-construction, and the fact that the French-Canadian pioneer is slow to migrate unless he can move directly into a parish already organized, with a parish church and a curé. Since Professor Vattier sent his book to press the latest volume of Abbé Ivanhoe Caron's authoritative work on the colonization of Quebec has been published, dealing with the period 1791-1815. In this volume Abbé Caron points to the legal difficulties and to the uncertainty in procedure attending the creation and erection of new Catholic parishes under early British rule, as one of the influences impeding colonization. It was a drawback that may be added to the many Professor Vattier adduces to explain why the French Canadian was slow to take up new land in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, whilst the eastern townships adjoining the United States were filling rapidly with American and British settlers. At present, as Professor Vattier makes clear, the French Catholic Church and the Quebec government are working towards the same end, namely: to stem the tide of French-Canadian emigration to the United States, to offset the effects of industrialization by

promoting the spread of population onto the land, and to encourage the old rural life of the countryside through an educational system directed to that end, so as to preserve the original character of the French-Canadian people and keep them attached to the soil of the province. That the future of French Canada is involved in this programme is the reason for its being taken now with such serious concern by both church and state; the economic benefits of colonization are merely secondary to a much more important nationalist purpose.

C. E. FRYER.

## COMMUNICATIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Dear Sir: The review of my *History of the Regicides in New England* by Viola F. Barnes, in the *Review* of July, 1928, contains the statement, referring to me: "He has depended chiefly on printed colonial records, on collections of historical societies, and on local tradition which he seems to value almost as highly as documentary evidence. No use has been made of material in British archives", and again, "but he has concentrated his entire attention on presenting all the legends and facts connected with these striking figures". I must protest against such serious misrepresentation of facts as that I made no use of material in the British archives, and that I depended chiefly on local traditions and valued them almost as highly as documentary evidence, and that I concentrated my entire attention on presenting all the legends.

A great many of the documents which I used, quoted from, and cited were from the British archives, and had been printed some of them many years ago in volume III. of the *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New York*, and in the *Clarendon Papers* in the *New York Historical Society Collections*, volume II. (1869), and in third series of the *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, volume VIII., transcribed by James Savage in 1842, and in the *Randolph Papers*, published by the Prince Society, and in the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial and Domestic*. Great use was made of this material in the British archives. I also secured photostatic copies of two documents from the State Paper office.

Instead of "presenting all the legends" and "depending on local tradition which he seems to value almost as highly as documentary evidence", the fact is I did not even mention most of the traditions relating to the regicides in this country, because I relied chiefly on contemporary documentary evidence. President Stiles's *History of the Judges*, 1795, is largely, if not mostly, made up of traditions which he spent a long time in collecting. At least seventeen of the traditions narrated by Stiles are not so much as mentioned by me. Among these are the story of the encounter between the regicides and the sheriff at New Haven (p. 30) : the story of Sperry visited by the pursuers, but espied approaching over a causeway by the regicides who escaped (pp. 31, 78) ; story of the regicides' dexterity at fencing and acceptance of a challenge at Boston (p. 33) ; Howell's story (p. 66) ; traditions as to location of Hatchet Harbor (pp. 74-75) ; traditions of other residences of the regicides (pp. 78, 84) : story of girls spinning and singing a royalist song directly above the regicides (pp. 86, 90) ; description of Tomkins's Milford house (p. 89) ; traditions of other retreats of the regicides (pp. 112, 113) ; story of

Dixwell's piety (p. 127); Mrs. Pierpont's questioning her husband *re* Dixwell (p. 129); story of Sir Edmund Andros's inquiry *re* Dixwell (p. 130); story of singing the Fifty-second Psalm before Sir Edmund Andros (p. 130); tradition that Whalley and Goffe are buried in New Haven (p. 133, and 167, 198); traditions about settlement of Dixwell's English estate (p. 151); tradition that Mrs. Dixwell was the first to try inoculation for smallpox and died from it (p. 152); memoirs of Theophilus Whale (p. 339).

Besides these seventeen traditions given by Stiles there are in print and manuscript many other traditions relating to the regicides, which also I never mentioned in my history. My purpose was to depend not upon local traditions, but upon contemporary documentary evidence. Such evidence I believe I was the first to collect and cite in its entirety.

Very truly yours,

L. A. WELLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

My statement in the review of Mr. Welles's *The History of the Regicides in New England* in the July number of the *Review*: "No use has been made of material in British archives", referred only to the fact that no first-hand research of manuscript materials in British archives had been made but that the book was based for the most part on material available in printed collections. In stating that the author had "depended chiefly on printed colonial records" and on "collections of historical societies" I thought I had given adequate recognition of the use made of published sources taken from those archives.

I received my impression for the statement "he has concentrated his entire attention on presenting all the legends and facts connected with these striking figures" from Mr. Welles's introduction in which he gives his belief that he has included in his account "all the facts which have come to light and the names of all the persons known to have had anything to do with helping the distinguished exiles in Massachusetts and Connecticut". It seemed to me that the book contained many statements difficult to accept as facts and therefore better classed as legends. In fact, in the chapter on the Death of Whalley, the narrative (not including the two cited letters) is little else than an abstract or summary of the traditions concerning where Whalley was buried. I did not mean to question whether or not the author had succeeded in his avowed purpose to include "all the facts" but to say that the attempt to do so had according to his own stated words occupied his attention. In the light of Mr. Welles's confession as to the omission of seventeen or more traditions, my statement would perhaps be more accurately expressed: "he has concentrated his attention on presenting a comprehensive account of all of the facts and many of the legends connected with these striking figures."<sup>18</sup>

VIOLA F. BARNES.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

The Managing Editor having announced that other duties would make necessary his withdrawal from this service, the following minute was adopted by the Board, December 27, 1927:

The Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* desire to record their deep regret on the retirement of their colleague, J. Franklin Jameson, from the managing editorship of this journal, and to express also their sense of his unique contribution to the advancement of historical scholarship in this country.

By the happy choice of our first Board of Editors, in 1895, it fell largely to this young scholar, still in his thirties, to set the high standards which have gained the *Review* its enviable reputation at home and abroad. Though his own major interest has been in American history, he has brought to the editorial office a just appreciation of American and European scholarship in many other fields. The *Review* has thus been able to achieve under his direction an international character, not always found in scientific publications. After more than twenty-eight years of devoted service, continuous except for a single interval of four years, he now turns to "fresh woods and pastures new", taking with him the respect, the confidence, and the affection of his colleagues.

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The forty-third annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held at Indianapolis on Friday, Saturday, and Monday, December 28, 29, and 31. No formal meetings will be held on Sunday, December 30; the committee hopes, in fixing these dates, that members of the Association will welcome an opportunity to enjoy each other's society without the interruption of meetings. Allied societies convening at the same place and time will be the American Bibliographical Society, the American Catholic Historical Association, the National Council for Social Studies, and, as is usual, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society. The chairman of the Association's committee of local arrangements is Mr. J. W. Fesler of Indianapolis. The programme, prepared by a committee of which Dr. Christopher B. Coleman, secretary of the Indiana Historical Society, is chairman, will be in the hands of the members probably soon after this number of the *Review* reaches them. The address of the president, James H. Breasted, of the University of Chicago, will be delivered Friday evening. Saturday evening there will be a paper upon "Benjamin Harrison and the Venezuelan Tribunal at Paris", by A. T. Volwiler, and one by Richard H. Shryock upon the "Public Health Movement in the United States". The first meeting will be a joint meeting with the Mississippi Valley His-

torical Association at ten o'clock, Friday morning, December 28. Among the distinctive features of the programme will be a session devoted to the discussion of the paper by Professor Ulrich B. Phillips upon "The Central Theme of Southern History", printed on pages 30-43 in this issue. The discussion will be opened by three persons selected by the programme committee. Professor Phillips's paper itself will not be read at the meeting. Those in attendance are presumed to have read the article and to be prepared for critical discussion. A similar procedure is to be followed in a session devoted to medieval history, at which Professor Nellie Neilson's paper on "The Medieval Manor" will be discussed on the basis of previous perusal. This paper is to be published in the January number of this *Review* but reprints will be available in advance for those who are interested. At another sectional meeting, Professor Frank Maloy Anderson will present a specific problem, the identification of the author of the anonymous "Diary of a Public Man", published in the *North American Review* in 1879 (Vol. CXXIX., 125-140, 259-273, 375-388, 484-496). Professor Anderson's paper will be entitled "Who Wrote the 'Diary of a Public Man', Amos Kendall, Henry Wikoff, or X?" Three or four other historians who have worked upon this problem of identification will open the discussion, at which it is hoped progress may be made toward a definite conclusion of this interesting question. Among the other subjects to each of which a session will be devoted are: the American Revolution; the West Indies, a field which has hitherto received less attention at the Association meetings than its interest warrants; the Far East; modern English history; modern continental European history; and the freshman course in history. There will be, as usual, a conference on archives. One session will be under the direction of the committee on history and other social sciences in the schools. At the Conference of Historical Societies, Worthington C. Ford of the Massachusetts Historical Society will discuss "Historical Societies, Living and Dead". The Agricultural History Society will have a session and a luncheon or dinner. The local hospitality will include; for Sunday evening, a musical programme and a buffet supper at the John Herron Art Institute. The meeting will end with the afternoon session, Monday, December 31. The usual railroad rates have been secured giving a reduction of one-half of the return fare, on the certificate plan, on practically all of the roads in the United States and all in Canada except those in the far west.

The committee on history and other social studies in the schools held its last meeting at Hanover, September 1 and 2. Among other matters considered was the approval of a tentative list of objectives to serve as guides for the preparation of tests. These objectives will probably be discussed at the December meeting of the Association, as well as elsewhere, and consequently it seems advisable to print a conspectus here so that those who will attend the meeting may be prepared to participate in the discussion.

For the guidance of those members of the Association who are unfamiliar with this nomenclature it may be said that "objectives" is the term now in general use in the schools for the "aims and values" of an earlier day. Possibly the term has the more restricted connotation of such aims and values as are capable of demonstrable attainment. The term "tests" is likewise used in a somewhat special sense for measuring devices whose results have a standard meaning. The term "objective" or "new-type" test might have been used did these adjectives not connote too narrowly the staccato form of incomplete sentences and single line questions. They should however yield results whose value is not largely dependent upon the individual standards of the person scoring the tests.

Experience with such tests has justified the hope that considerable advance can be made in this direction. The committee is quite prepared to face the possibility that some of the following objectives will not lend themselves very far to such measurement. It will be noted that the list deals rather with the cumulative results of all instruction in the social studies than with the immediate results of separate courses; that it is concerned more with "what remains after the facts of class room instruction are forgotten" than with the information which the various courses offer. The list is not complete. It presents primarily those "intangible" objectives which experience has shown possible of some measurement.

I. Understanding of the principles and ideals of political, economic, social, and cultural institutions. Mere information about these institutions does not constitute sufficient evidence of understanding; the latter is the desired outcome.

II. Skill in the use of sources of information, such as current gossip, oral and printed; reasoned discussion, oral and printed; social activities, real or pictured; material achievement, in use or relic. The skills necessary to deal with such sources range from simple physical finding and manipulation to subtle critical analysis. A series of tests ranging from the simple to the more complex will be needed to measure the acquisition of these skills.

III. Acquisition of points of view, interests, and attitudes:

(a) *Perspective view of current events.* To treat current affairs on the basis of reflection and not merely on direct impulse is an ideal toward which all social studies contribute. This value arises more specifically from comparisons with, or contrasts to, similar occurrences at other times or in other lands.

(b) *Historical mindedness.* In its simplest form this value involves the habitual association of events with the times at which they occurred. It should, however, involve a recognition of society as a constantly changing complex whose single events can only be understood in connection with that complex. It involves too that sympathetic judgment of the past so much emphasized by J. H. Robinson.

(c) *Locational mindedness.* This value is like the preceding and involves directly the habitual association of events with the regions in which they occur.

(d) *Concern for the common good.* This value is usually included in the term patriotism. The tendency to recognize individual welfare in the welfare of the group or to respect the common welfare as a desirable end in itself is professedly one of the chief aims of the social studies.

(e) *Tolerance: racial, religious, national, and social.* Acquaintance with and understanding of other races, religions, nations, and social groups is believed to contribute toward this end.

(f) *Leisure interests.* The awakening of some interests whose satisfaction will engross considerable leisure time whether during school age or thereafter is regarded as a desirable outcome of the study of the social subjects.

IV. *Activities, actual participation in.* This is less a distinct value than a transfer of the other values to the realm of activity. Every teacher believes that there is such transfer both in the case of information and of attitudes. It may be difficult to demonstrate such value in the activities of adult life but the activities of school age may throw some light on this question.

V. *Social Orientation.* This is an aggregate though nevertheless real value, gained from the systematic study of the social subjects. It involves an acquaintance with the variety of social activities, their inter-relationship, and a record of the great achievements in the different fields. As this value rises from a comprehensive survey, both chronological and geographical tests, must be constructed on that basis.

The committee having in charge the "revolving fund" (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII, 933) has accepted as the fourth volume for publication *The Iron Industry in Virginia* by Dr. Kathleen Bruce of William and Mary College. The three volumes which had previously been accepted are announced for publication, the first *The Day of Yahweh* in December 1928, and the two others *Planter Class in the British Caribbean* and *Desertion during the Civil War* early in 1929.

No. 5 of the *Bulletin* of the International Committee of Historical Sciences is given over wholly to "scientific reports presented to the sixth international congress of historical sciences" at Oslo. There are seventeen, some very brief, others of considerable length. The longest is a very interesting paper on *l'ancienne Université de Paris* as an international centre, adequately annotated, by Jean Bonnerot. The only report directly concerning America is by Dr. Kidder on "the present state of knowledge of American history and civilization prior to 1492". In general the reports emphasize the international phases of the various subjects and repeatedly stress the need of collaboration for such problems, for example, as the historical importance of the great migrations (presented by Halphen) or the international rôle of the papacy in the Middle Ages (presented by Fläche). The influence of present-day interests is illus-

trated in the discussion of the problem of nationality in history presented by Walek-Czarnecki for ancient times, Handelsman for the middle ages, and Dembinski for the modern period. Other reports deal with enlightened despotism, the union of the churches, the development of the Roman law, the provincial estates, banking, Roman art, the influence of Oriental art on the West, the influence of French art abroad, and iconography. It is needless to say that the authors are masters each in his own field.

The special subcommittee of the International Committee of Historical Sciences which has in charge the editorship of the International Yearbook of Historical Bibliography (*cf. Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII, 381-382) announces that it has received from the coöperating committees in the various countries about 12,000 titles for the volume for 1926 and that this volume will be published in the early part of next year. They hope to expedite the work so that the volume for 1927 can be published in the summer, and the volume for 1928 by Christmas, 1929. The final subdivisions adopted for the volumes vary only slightly from those already announced. The committee, from their experience in gathering the material for 1926, has prepared a new circular (July) defining more carefully the exact information needed from the contributors. Copies of this circular may be obtained by applying to the office of this *Review*.

#### PERSONAL

Sir George Otto Trevelyan died on August 16, at the age of 90. A nephew of Macaulay, he followed in his footsteps as poet, historian, and statesman. He was a member of Parliament for 32 years and Chief Secretary for Ireland for two eventful years. In this *Review* we naturally dwell upon his career as an historian. His *Life and Letters of Macaulay*, published in 1876, may not be critical but is generally recognized as one of the greatest of biographies. In 1880 appeared *The Early History of Charles James Fox* and Trevelyan's reputation as an historian was assured. His political activities delayed the continuation of his historical work and it was only in 1909, when he was 71, that the four volumes of *The American Revolution* were published. This was followed in 1912 by the first volume of *George III. and Charles Fox*, the second volume of which was published two years later. The characteristics of his work are too well known to need comment here. It is worthy of note that the various phases of his activities are being carried on by his three sons—history brilliantly by the youngest, George Macaulay Trevelyan.

Henry William Carless Davis, regius professor of modern history in the University of Oxford, died on June 29, at the early age of fifty-four. For nineteen years, 1902-1921, he was fellow and tutor of Balliol College, his leading work during that period being *England under the Normans and Angevins* (1905). His war-time service in the War Trade Intelligence Department, however, turned his mind to modern history. From

1921 to 1925 he was professor of modern history at Manchester. In 1925 he succeeded Sir Charles Firth at Oxford.

Dr. J. Horace Round died on June 24, at the age of seventy-four. A private scholar, lord of a manor in Essex, he neither sought nor received academic positions, though for several years he held the honorary office, created in his favor, of historical adviser to the crown in peerage cases. History on a large scale he did not attempt, but he produced a great number of closely reasoned studies on particular subjects, usually marked by great severity of criticism, for he was by nature pugnacious, and chronic ill-health added to the acidity of his controversial style. The most famous of his early writings was his attack on the methods of Freeman. His great services to English historical scholarship lay in the insistence on record-evidence rather than that of chronicles. His chief published collections of studies were *Geoffrey de Mandeville* (1892), *Feudal England* (1895), and *Peerage and Pedigree* (1910).

Edward Armstrong, well known to all scholars of the Italian Renaissance, died at Oxford on April 14 at the age of eighty-two. Among his writings may be mentioned, *Lorenzo de' Medici* in the Heroes of the Nations series, *French Wars of Religion* (1892), *Elizabeth Farnese* (1892), *Emperor Charles V.* (1902, second edition 1910), and his chapters in the *Cambridge Modern History*. He was also a frequent contributor to the *English Historical Review* and other periodicals.

Edward Murray Wrong, fellow and tutor of Magdalen, died on March 27, at the age of thirty-eight. He was Beit lecturer from 1919 to 1924 and was the author of *Charles Buller and Responsible Government* (1925) and of the *History of England, 1688-1815*, recently added to the Home University Library.

William Milligan Sloane died on September 12 after a long illness. As he had a deep interest in the American Historical Association, served as an editor of this *Review* and as president of the Association, he was well known to all the older members, who grieve for the loss of a friend. He was born in 1850; from 1873-1875 he was secretary to George Bancroft in Berlin; he was professor in Princeton for 20 years and in Columbia for an equal period, until his retirement in 1916. He was the author of many works of which the best known is *Napoleon Bonaparte*, in four volumes, published in 1901, revised edition in 1911. He was continually writing and his friends referred to his "five-foot shelf" of works; the last, *Greater France in Morocco*, was published in 1924. He was president of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, and was the recipient of decorations from the French and Swedish governments.

Earnest A. Balch, for many years professor of history at Kalamazoo College, died suddenly on June 24 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. At the time of his death he was Mayor of Kalamazoo.

To succeed the late H. W. C. Davis as regius professor of modern history at the University of Oxford, the king has approved the appointment of Frederick Maurice Powicke, M.A., Hon.Litt.D., F.B.A., who has been professor of medieval history in the University of Manchester since 1919. Among Professor Powicke's more important works are: *The Loss of Normandy, 1913* (reviewed in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIX, 342), *Ailred of Rievaulx* (1922), and *Stephen Langton* (1928). A review of the last work will be published in this journal.

Henry Arderne Ormerod, professor of Greek at the University of Leeds since 1923, has been appointed to the Rathbone Professorship of Ancient History in the University of Liverpool.

Professor Paul van Dyke is again to be director of the American University Union at Paris, a position which he filled with so much distinction 1917-1919 with the title of secretary, and again, 1921-1923, as director.

Professor Benjamin F. Prince, a trustee of the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society for over a quarter of a century and teacher in Wittenberg College for over half a century, has retired from active service. Dr. A. T. Volwiler has been made head of the department of history at Wittenberg. Benjamin H. Pershing has been appointed associate professor, William Gotwald and Harvey De Weerd, assistant professors.

Professor W. J. Wilkinson, formerly of Colby University, has been appointed to the headship of the department of history at the University of Vermont.

Miss Elizabeth Donnan will be on leave of absence from Wellesley College during the year 1928-1929. She will spend the year in Washington working on the "Slave Trade: Sources and Methods of Supply", which will be published by the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution.

Professor Herbert C. Bell will be absent on leave from Wesleyan University during the academic year 1928-1929.

In Yale University Dr. Ralph H. Gabriel has been made a professor of history.

Mr. Allan Nevins, formerly of Cornell University, is to be an associate in history in Columbia University.

C. H. Ambler of the University of West Virginia is to be acting professor of history in the Ohio State University, Columbus, for the present academic year.

A. P. Whitaker has been appointed to an associate professorship in Adelbert College, Western Reserve University.

Professor Hastings Eells of Ohio Wesleyan University has received a C.R.B. fellowship, and has been given leave of absence to complete his biography of Martin Bucer.

At the University of Chicago during the academic year 1928-1929, Professor Harley F. MacNair of St. Johns University, Shanghai, will offer courses on the history and institutions of the Far East; and Dr. José Vasconcelos, former minister of public instruction in Mexico under the Obregon administration, will offer courses in Hispanic-American history during the winter quarter, 1929. Dr. A. O. Craven, formerly of the University of Illinois, has been made an associate professor in American history.

W. B. Hesseltine has been appointed professor of history in the University of Chattanooga.

In our July number we stated incorrectly that H. M. Ehrman had been made a professor of history in the University of Michigan. Mr. Ehrman has been made an assistant professor of modern European history.

Professor F. H. Hodder of the University of Kansas will teach during 1928-1929 in Cornell University. His work in the University of Kansas will be carried on by Dr. Annie H. Abel-Henderson, formerly of Smith College.

Paul H. Clyde of the Ohio State University has leave of absence for this academic year and will teach at Stanford University.

Professor Arthur I. Andrews, recently of the University of Vermont, will devote the present year to the preparation for the press of two works on the history of Southeastern Europe, on which he has been engaged for a long time.

#### GENERAL

In January the *Review* will publish an account of the Sixth International Congress of Historical Sciences, held at Oslo. After the Congress, the members participated in an excursion to Norway and then proceeded to Copenhagen where a special programme was arranged followed by another excursion. The whole occupied the time from August 14 to August 27.

The Royal Historical Society invites essays in competition for the Alexander Prize. The candidates may choose their own subjects but must submit their choices for the approval of the literary director. The essays must show signs of original research, must not exceed 10,000 words in length, and must be sent in on or before March 31, 1929. Those interested should apply for further particulars to the Secretary, Royal Historical Society, 22 Russell Square, London, W.C.1.

All students of church history and all medievalists recognize their debt to the Bollandists, "the oldest scientific body in existence and with the longest recorded history". At its meeting in April the Council of the Mediaeval Academy of America voted: "In the opinion of the Council any diminution or interruption in the work of the Bollandists would be of great harm to the progress of Mediaeval studies." But this work has been seriously and continuously threatened since the World War.

The editors have gone on courageously but have not been able to secure funds necessary to meet the increasing costs of publication and of their constantly expanding task. The sum needed is small in comparison with the value of their work. A Bollandist Auxiliary Society has been formed to raise at once a capital sum of \$10,000 to repair the losses due to the war, and to secure a sum sufficient to provide an annual income of \$5000. The Mediaeval Academy has already contributed \$3550. The president of the organizing committee of the Auxiliary Society is J. Renkin, Minister of State, Belgium, the vice-president is the well-known scholar and chief editor of the Bollandists, Rev. Fr. H. Delehaye, S.J. The honorary members include well-known scholars from England, Italy, France, Germany, Austria, and the United States. The last is represented by C. H. Haskins, J. F. Jameson, Mgr. J. H. Ryan, and J. T. Shotwell.

It would be a disgrace to the present age if this great work begun 325 years ago should be crippled for the lack of a small subvention. Fuller information concerning the history of the society and the need for funds can be found in *The Bollandists*, edited by C. S. Langdale (Brussels, Bollandist Auxiliary Society). Contributions may be sent to the American Exchange Irving Trust Company, New York City, or directly to the Treasurer, Bollandist Auxiliary Society, 128 rue Froissart, Brussels, Belgium.

H. B. Van Hoesen's important manual, *Bibliography, Practical, Enumerative, Historical*, has been published by Scribner.

The small volume on *History and Historical Research* by C. G. Crump (London, Routledge) is intended primarily for beginners in research but will interest, or provoke, many older scholars.

The editors announce that the *Journal of Modern History* plans to publish articles; documents, particularly those from local or private archives; "historical revisions", i.e., short articles showing how traditional views have been modified by modern research; reviews, some of them of considerable length; bibliographical surveys; bibliographical notes; and historical information.

Mr. Haselden of the Henry E. Huntington Library writes that the task of cataloguing their manuscripts which "cover a period of about 900 years and consist of personal papers, charters, court rolls, official papers, etc." has hardly begun; only 3500 items so far have been catalogued. "The number of manuscripts in the Library is so large that elaborate cataloguing is impossible. Cards are made primarily for finding purposes and contain date, author's name, addressee or title of the document; bibliographical description and accession number." It is, however, evident from his account that a student will find satisfactory guidance to all manuscripts as soon as they are catalogued.

With Professor Paul Herre as general editor, the publishing house called Athenaion (Wildpark-Potsdam) launches a somewhat gigantic

series of illustrated volumes (fifty-one are already announced) to form a *Museum der Weltgeschichte*. Two that have already appeared are *Die Öffentliche Meinung in der Weltgeschichte*, by Professor Wilhelm Bauer of Vienna, and *Weltgeschichte des Krieges*, by Major Dr. Paul Schmittner of Heidelberg. Further illustrations of the *kulturschichtlich* scope of the enterprise may be seen in such titles as the history of revolutions (H. Glagau), of superstition, of nobility, of high finance, of colonization, of peasantry, of monasticism, of romanticism, of the theatre, and of luxury.

In the *Quarterly Review* for July there is a valuable discussion of source material under the heading New Materials for History.

The first number of the *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale* will be published next January. It is to be a quarterly under the editorship of MM. Bloch and Febvre, both of the University of Strasbourg. It will contain articles, documents and critical notes, reviews, and a *chronique*. There is a notable *comité de rédaction* and the first list of *collaborateurs* includes well-known scholars from Belgium, England, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Spain, and Switzerland, as well as over thirty from France. Each number of the review will contain about 160 pages and the annual subscription for scholars in the United States will be sixty francs. Armand Colin, Paris, is the publisher.

A brief index for the first six years of its existence (1922-1927) has been published by *Estudios Eclesiásticos*, Madrid.

The July number of the *Catholic Historical Review* contains two important articles, Nationalism at the Council of Constance, by the Rev. George C. Powers, and the Origins of "Real Patronato de Indias", by J. Lloyd Mecham. The document printed in this number is the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI. (Jan. 6) on the "Fostering of True Religious Unity".

The *Journal of Negro History*, July number, contains an article by N. Andrew N. Cleven on the First Panama Mission and the Congress of the United States; one by W. Sherman Savage on the Negro in the History of the Pacific Northwest; and one by Jean Trepp on the Liverpool Movement for the Abolition of the English Slave Trade. More than half the issue is occupied with extracts from the records of the African companies, collected by Ruth A. Fisher.

*A Decade of Negro Self-Expression* (the Trustees of the John F. Slater Fund, *Occasional Papers*, no. 26), is an annotated list of books written by negroes since the outbreak of the World War, with a dissertation by Alain Locke and an introduction by Howard W. Odum.

A second, revised edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft* (five volumes), edited by Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack, is announced by Mohr (Tübingen).

The eighth edition of Sir Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture on the Comparative Method* is published by Batsford (London).

The latest number in the Berkshire Studies in European History, published by Holt (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII, 469), is *The Geographical Basis of European History* by John Kirtland Wright. It contains an excellent bibliographical note.

Jonathan Nield has revised his *Guide to the Best Historical Novels and Tales* (London, Mathews and Marrot).

*Christianity and the State*, by William Temple, bishop of Manchester, consists of the Henry Scott Holland memorial lectures delivered in Liverpool, 1928 (Macmillan).

Charles Singer has collected seven of his essays under the title *From Magic to Science*. The contents deal mainly with the history of medicine. A special feature is a series of colored illustrations, partly from the book of Hildegard of Bingen (London, Benn).

In the domain of social and economic history there is a new volume (II.) in *Reimanns Weltgeschichte: Wirtschafts und Sozialgeschichte* by Professor Carl Brinkmann (Munich and Berlin, Oldenbourg).

*A Survey of Socialism, Analytical, Historical, and Critical*, by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, is published by Macmillan.

Probably the most valuable volume in the series: "Les Textes du Christianisme", is the one just issued, *Les Documents Pontificaux sur la Démocratie et la Société Moderne*, by Georges Michon (Paris, Rieder).

In his volume, *We Fight for Oil* (New York, Knopf), Ludwig Denny gives a journalistic account of the recent struggle for the control of the world's supply, especially between British and American interests. It is very fully documented and well annotated.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ellsworth Huntington, *Temperature and the Fate of Nations* (Harper's, August); Lewis R. Freeman, *Trailing History down the Big Muddy* (National Geographic, July); J. D. Unwin, *Marriage in Cultural History* (Hibbert Journal, July); E. B. Burgrum, *Victorianism* (Sewanee Review, July-September); Charles A. Beard, *Is Western Civilization in Peril?* (Harper's, August).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

The latest general history of the world is an English undertaking in which "a hundred and fifty of our foremost living authorities" have coöperated. Curiously enough the "hundred and fifty" thus lauded include a wealth of names which command our respect, e.g., Trevelyan, Petrie, Laski, Fraser, Gardner, Garstang, Myres. The title is *Universal History of the World*, edited by J. A. Hammerton. Three volumes have been published: the first, *Earliest Times to Egyptian Empire*; the second covers the history from the Hittites to the Peloponnesian War; the third,

Roman history to Hadrian. From the table of contributors and the contents it is evident that these volumes form an important contribution (Amalgamated Press).

The Oxford University Press announces for publication *The Sumerians* by C. Leonard Woolley whose special competence is attested by the work which he has done on the joint expedition of the British Museum and of the University of Pennsylvania.

A French translation of Breasted's *History of Egypt* has appeared (Paris, Vromant).

Number 30 (April) of the *Bulletin* of the American Schools of Oriental Research has a brief account of *The Joint Expedition of Harvard University and the Baghdad School at Yargon Tepa near Kirkuk*, said to be "the best equipped which has ever been sent over to Iraq". Preliminary reports indicate valuable finds, especially bronze armor more than 3000 years old, mural paintings, a thousand tablets, and much charred grain.

Seven years after the publication of the first volume Macmillan has brought out vol. II. of Sir Arthur Evans's *Palace of Minos at Knossos*, "fresh light" on the successive stages of Cretan civilization as illustrated by his discoveries at Knossos during the last twenty-five years. The volume is published in two parts with hundreds of illustrations. The price is 7 guineas.

The Loeb Classical Library (Putnam) has issued the fifth volume of Strabo, the third of Josephus, the first (of three) of Isocrates, the first (of three) of Seneca's *Moral Essays*, the second (of four) of the letters of Saint Basil, and the *De Re Publica* and the *De Legibus* of Cicero.

The Leipzig firm of B. G. Teubner publishes the first volume of a series of *Papyri Graecae Magicae: die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, edited by Karl Preisendanz, presenting texts, brief notes, and translations into German, all of much interest to students of religious history and of folklore. The materials are derived from papyri in the museums of Berlin, Paris, London, Leiden, and Oslo.

The University of California Press has published the *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, the Sather Classical lectures delivered there by Duane Reed Stuart of Princeton.

La Renaissance du Livre (Paris) announces *La Cité Grecque* by G. Glotz, a new volume in the "Évolution de l'Humanité".

The appearance of a quarterly, *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen, Sprache, Dichtung, Sitte*, is announced by Gruyter (Hamburg).

Victor Chapot's *Monde Romaine*, reviewed in this journal, XXXIII. 97, has been translated into English by E. A. Parker for the History of Civilization series published by Knopf.

*Caligula, Étude d'un Cas de Folie Césarienne à Rome* is a French translation by Gaston Moch from the famous German work of Ludwig Quidde published a generation ago (Alcan, Paris).

A translation of the third edition of the *Histoire du Droit Romain* by Pietro Bonfante has been made by Jean Carrère and François Fournier (Paris, Sirey).

*L'Architecture Religieuse en France à l'Époque Romaine* by R. de Lasteyrie has appeared in a second edition supplemented by a critical bibliography by Marcel Aubert (Paris, Picard).

The Cambridge University Press will publish a translation of the important work on Dacia, by the late Vasile Pârvan, which was reviewed in the January number. The translation has been made by Messrs. Evans and Charlesworth under the title, *Dacia: an Outline of the Early Civilizations of the Carpatho-Danubian Countries*.

Of considerable interest to students in several fields, including history, is the *Preliminary Report upon the Excavations carried out in the Hippodrome of Constantinople in 1927* (London, Oxford University Press, 1928).

The Commercial Museum of Philadelphia has published a translation of the *Periplus of the Outer Sea, East and West, and of the Great Islands Therein*, by Marcian of Heraclea (c. 400 A.D.). The translation was made by Dr. W. H. Schoff who has supplied a valuable foreword and notes.

Noteworthy article in periodical: W. A. Westermann, *The Progress of the Cambridge Ancient History* (Political Science Quarterly, June).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Vol. XLVI., fasc. I. and II., of the *Analecta Bollandiana* contains as usual a wealth of material. The longest articles are "La Vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses Recensions", and a catalogue of the Latin hagiographical manuscripts in the libraries of Dublin. The bibliographical bulletin contains reviews and notes on eighty-five works. The excellence of the contents furnishes another argument, if one were needed, for the necessity of financing the work of the society which holds an unique position in the world of learning.

H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton have brought out, through Macmillan, the second volume of their edition of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, containing the introduction, editorial notes, and index.

Sir E. A. Wallis Budge has made a complete translation of the *Synaxarium* under the title of *The Book of the Saints of the Ethiopian Church*. This is important for the relations between the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, and Constantinople, and for the heresies of

the early centuries as well as for Christian folklore. The translation is published by the Cambridge University Press (4 vols.).

The first volume from the *Congrès d'Histoire du Christianisme*, published in *Annales d'Histoire du Christianisme* (Paris, Rieder), deals chiefly with religious and theological topics. Announced for early publication are volumes II. and III. relating to medieval and modern Christianity.

*The Life and Times of Saint Ambrose*, bishop of Milan, by P. de Labriolle, is a translation by Herbert Wilson published by Herder (St. Louis).

Noteworthy article in periodical: W. A. Phillips, *Papal Monarchy* [review of Shotwell and Loomis's *See of Peter*] (*Edinburgh Review*, July).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Professor J. F. Willard's sixth bulletin of the *Progress of Medieval Studies* (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIII, 213) continues to expand and to increase in usefulness. It contains a full report of the meeting of the Mediaeval Academy of America, April, 1928; it lists 53 books and monographs published in 1927 and 59 in press; also it gives the titles of 183 doctoral dissertations in progress or completed in 1927. The number of medievalists listed has been increased to 422.

The Edward Kennard Rand Prize in Mediaeval Studies for 1928 was awarded to Professor Louis J. Paetow for his *Morale Scholarium* of John of Garland (University of California Press, 1927). It is expected that this work will be reviewed in our next number.

To the volumes attempting to assess the legacy of the Middle Ages W. E. Brown, sometime lecturer in history in the University of Glasgow, has added *The Achievement of the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, Sands).

The first fascicule (on the Western Roman Empire from 395 to 888) of section II., *Histoire Générale*, edited by Gustave Glotz, has now appeared (Les Presses Universitaires de France). This fascicule begins the story of the Middle Ages and is written by Ferdinand Lot, Christian Pfister, and François-Louis Ganshof.

The second volume of the *Glossaire Archéologique: du Moyen-Age et de la Renaissance* (H-Z), by Victor Gay, has been published by Picard (Paris).

Aschikpaschazade's *Altosmanische Chronik*, edited by F. Giese, a critical edition from early manuscripts, is announced by Otto Harrassowitz of Leipzig.

The Society for Franciscan Studies has in the press two volumes: the revised edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis* which the late M. Sabatier left in manuscript not quite completed, now prepared for publication by Mr. A. G. Little, and a volume of the medical writings of Roger Bacon, also edited by Mr. Little.

Perrin (Paris) has just published a study of medieval monastic life, *La Vie Mystique d'un Monastère de Dominicains au Moyen Age* (from the Chronicle of Töss) by Jeanne Ancelet-Hustache.

Vol. XIV. of Dr. Horace K. Mann's *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages* is *Innocent IV., the Magnificent, 1243-1271* (St. Louis, Herder).

P. E. Matheson has published (Oxford University Press) *A Life of Hastings Rashdall*, author of *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. A new edition of this work is in preparation under the editorship of F. M. Powicke now of Oxford and H. H. E. Craster of the Bodleian. They have sought the coöperation of other scholars in making corrections and additions.

Edward J. Martin writes of *The Trial of the Templars* (London, Allen and Unwin) from the standpoint of modern nationalism. He concludes that "there is a strong presumption that the Order was corrupt spiritually if not morally . . . that its existence could be no longer continued without gravely menacing the States of Europe . . . [Philip the Fair's] action against the Templars is simply a contribution to the cause of progress".

The Institut Belge de Rome has published, as the ninth volume of its *Analecta Vaticano-Belgica*, vol. I., 1362-1366, of the *Lettres d'Urbain V.* (Brussels, P. Imbrechts, 1928, pp. 1089), edited by the late A. Fierens and M. Camille Tibon.

Announced for publication before the end of 1928 is *Ymago Mundi* by Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, Chancellor of the University of Paris (1350-1420), in Latin text with French translation. The study on the sources of this author is by Edmund Buron. There is an introductory chapter on d'Ailly and Columbus, besides copious notes (Paris, Maisonneuve).

The Century Company has published a revised edition of the *Middle Ages* by Dana C. Munro, with supplementary chapters on the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by Raymond J. Sontag.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Louis Bréhier, *Charlemagne et la Palestine* (*Revue Historique*, March-April); O. Vehse, *Das Bündnis gegen die Sarazenen vom Jahre 915* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, XIX.); Abbé Rony, *La Politique Française de Grégoire VII.: Conflit entre le Pape et son Légat* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); M. Pistan, *Credit in Medieval Trade* (*Economic History Review*, January); E. K. Rand, *Life and I* (*Speculum*, July).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Josèphe Chartrou's *Les Entrées Solennelles et Triomphales à la Renaissance* is published by Les Presses Universitaires de France (Paris). The author compares medieval and ancient pageants of victory.

In a *Note-Book of European History, 1400-1920* (New York, Crowell, pp. 220), S. H. McGrady offers a "vade mecum to many a har-

ried teacher as well as student". It is a brief digest of the facts supposed to be necessary for the "examination grind". Many teachers, not "harried", would object to the excessive emphasis upon the Renaissance but in general the book seems as accurate as any of its kind.

Shortly to appear as Beiheft 14 of the *Historische Zeitschrift* is *Die Politische Entwicklung Ulrichs von Hutten während der Entscheidungsjahre der Reformation* by Fritz Walser (Munich and Berlin, Oldenbourg).

In *Art and the Reformation*, G. G. Coulton has again attacked some of the currently (and erroneously) accepted generalizations concerning the Middle Ages. His great learning, the fruit of long study of the documents, together with his skill in presentation, enable him to set forth clearly the work of the medieval artist. His book will cause acrid comment in some quarters.

*Martin Luther* by Lucien Febvre has just been published by Rieder (Paris).

Several years ago Professor C. van Vollenhoven of Leiden and Dr. P. C. Molhuysen of the Royal Library at the Hague instituted plans for a scientific edition of the works of Hugo Grotius. Means were found. Dr. Molhuysen's edition of the *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* appeared in 1919. An edition of the poems is being prepared by the Royal Academy of Sciences, of Amsterdam. Lately there has appeared (*Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën*, no. 64, I.) the first volume of the correspondence, *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, I. (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1928, pp. xxxiii, 659), prepared by Dr. Molhuysen after thorough search of European and American libraries. It runs from 1597 to Aug. 17, 1618, a few days before Grotius's imprisonment, and contains, after a learned and interesting introduction, 582 letters, mostly of Grotius, nearly all in Latin, a fourth of them hitherto unpublished.

The Earl of Ilchester and Mrs. Langford-Brooke have edited and translated the *Correspondence of Catherine the Great when Grand Duchess with Sir Charles Hanbury-Williams* (London, Thornton Butterworth).

Number X. in the "Collection des Études Politiques et Sociales" of L'Eglantine (Paris) is a book with considerable historical content: *La Réforme Agraire en Europe* by Arthur Wauters.

The last volume (in Czech) of the noteworthy five-volume study of Europe from 1812 to 1914 by Professor Josef Šusta has been published in Prague (Vesmir).

Volume III. of *British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, is *The Testing of the Entente, 1904-1906*. As in the case of the first two volumes (reviewed XXXIII. 648) it is edited by G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley with the assistance of Lillian M. Penson (London, H. M. Stationery Office).

Prince Lichnowsky's reminiscences have been translated and published under the title *Heading for the Abyss* (London, Constable). It contains a complete collection of his despatches from 1912 to 1914; his well-known pamphlet, *My Mission to London*, and criticisms of Germany's policy toward Russia and Austria.

Three books are announced by the University Press Association (New York) as results of the Institute of Politics of 1927: *Diplomatic Europe since the Treaty of Versailles* by Count Carlo Sforza; *The Economic, Financial, and Political State of Germany Since the War* by Dr. Peter P. Reinhold; and *Aspects of British Foreign Policy* by Sir Arthur Willert.

In his partisan study of the peace treaties, *Der Revision der Friedensverträge* (Berlin, Stilka), Geza Lukacs, the Hungarian statesman, advocates a complete revision of them.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Séé, *Le Commerce Français à Cadix et dans l'Amérique Espagnole au XVIIIe Siècle* (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne*, January–February); Sir Richard Lodge, *First Anglo-Russian Treaty, 1739–1742* (*English Historical Review*, July); W. N. Medlicott, *The Berlin Treaty: Fifty Years Afterwards* (*Quarterly Review*, July); Josef Redlich, *Hapsburg Policy in the Balkans before the War* (*Foreign Affairs*, July); *Der Zaristische Diplomatie über Russlands Aufgaben im Orient im Jahre 1900* (*Kriegsschuldfrage*, July); Otto Lerche, *Das Material der Zeitgeschichte* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, VI. 2).

#### THE WORLD WAR

For those interested in the war-guilt controversies quite a large and increasing collection of material is available. In *Current History* for July, the topic *Did Germany Incite Austria in 1914?* is discussed by a group of writers on the basis of alleged newly discovered evidence. It would be well to warn readers that the whole series should be read, not simply the first part of it, and that the last discussion by Dr. Florinski is by no means the least valuable of the collection. Further discussions of the war-guilt issue are announced for subsequent treatment in the same periodical.

The article by Alfred von Wegerer in the *Political Science Quarterly* for June, 1928, on the *Russian Mobilization of 1914* should also be read in company with that of Michael T. Florinski with the same title in the same publication for June, 1927. The key article in *Current History* for August is also by Herr von Wegerer, and here the attack is upon the commission that reported the famous resolution on war guilt to the Peace Congress of 1919. Members of that commission reply more or less briefly; to Professor Preston W. Slosson, however, was assigned the task of correcting Herr von Wegerer's arguments.

A comparison of some recent articles on the "Kriegsschuldfrage" published in *Der Krieg* might be profitable: "Revanche für Bukarest" (April); "Wann Wurden Deutschlands Ultimaten Beschllossen?"

(May); "Wie Bosnien Regiert Wurde?", and "Der Wahre Kriegsgrund Deutschlands" (June).

Eugen Fischer's *Die Kritischen 39 Tage: von Sarajewo bis zum Weltbrand* is published by Ullstein in Berlin.

The first part of General Huguet's volume on *L'Intervention Militaire Britannique en 1914* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) deals with the period before the war and the formation of the military entente.

*The Life of General Lord Rawlinson of Trent from his Journals and Letters*, edited by Maj.-Gen. Sir Frederick Maurice, has been published by Cassell. Lord Rawlinson was commander of the Fourth Army in the battles of the Somme and of Amiens. General Maurice had for use in compiling this work sixty volumes of Rawlinson's diaries and a huge mass of letters.

The second part (Bände 4-8 inclusive) of *Dic Ursachen der Deutschen Zusammenbruchs im Jahre 1918*, entitled *Der Innere Zusammenbruch (Heimatspolitik und Umsturzbewegung)*, is announced by the Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, of Berlin.

Heft 3 of the "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nachbismarckischen Zeit und des Weltkriegs", edited by Dr. Fritz Kern of Bonn, is *Krieg und Verwaltung in Serbien und Macedonien, 1916 bis 1918*, by Paul Kirch (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer).

The Yale University Press has brought out, in the series Economic and Social History of the World War, *Der Krieg und die Arbeitsverhältnisse: die Deutschen Gewerkschaften im Kriege: die Gewerbliche Frauenarbeit während des Krieges*, by Paul Umbreit and Charlotte Lorenz.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *Ein Paar Körnchen Wahrheit* [in part a review of Fischer's *Die Kritischen 39 Tage*] (Der Krieg, July); Gustav Roloff, *Die Entscheidenden Stunden im Juli 1914* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, VI. 2); Gottlieb von Jagow, *Die Deutsche Politische Leitung und England bei Kriegsausbruch* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Herr Paul, *Antonio Salandra und die Italienische Neutralitätserklärung* (Kriegsschuldfrage, May); *Ein Neuer Vorstoß der Kriegsschuld-Propaganda* (Der Krieg, May); *Die Amerikanischen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch und zu den Ersten Vermittlungsvorschlägen [Fortsetzung]* (Kriegsschuldfrage, July).

#### GREAT BRITAIN

A hand-list of additions to the collection of Latin manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, 1908-1928, is published in the *Bulletin* for July. Among the 211 items listed there are many of interest among which may be noted a "valuable collection of royal account-books" (nos. 230-242).

Fragments of an Anglo-Saxon Survey from Bury St. Edmunds is published in the *English Historical Review* for July. The fragments

contain many interesting points on the economic conditions just before the Conquest, but are of especial importance for the light they throw upon "the general problem of the early hundred".

Number 16 (June) of the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research contains "an unpublished poem on Bishop Stephen Gardiner" and summaries of theses on: English embassies to France in the reign of Edward I., a history of Clare, Suffolk (especially as a centre of the woolen industry); the administrative work of the lord chancellor in the early seventeenth century; constitutional struggles in Jamaica, 1748-1776; beginnings of missionary enterprise in South Africa; and the policy of the British government towards the South African Dutch republics, 1848-1872.

The *Mariner's Mirror* for July contains the Journal of Grenville Collins, author of *Great Britain's Coasting Pilot*, beginning in 1676 and mainly concerned with the difficulties with the Algerines (edited by F. E. Dyer); English Galleys in 1295, by R. C. Anderson, based upon the account in a Southampton manuscript of the expenses for building a galley; and Naval Actions between the Portuguese and Dutch in India, 1654, a Portuguese manuscript translated by C. R. Boxer. All students of nautical matters will be interested in the Notes, Answers, and Queries.

Volume III. of the *Naval Miscellany*, edited by W. G. Perrin and printed for the Naval Record Society, contains Admiral Richmond's "Land Forces of France, June 1738", a valuable survey of the resources of France and Spain; letters of Benjamin Thompson (Baron Rumford); and numerous other items, including letters of Blake and Nelson.

The Raleigh Lecture on History in 1927 was delivered by Professor F. M. Stenton on *The Danes in England*. It is reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIII., by the Oxford University Press.

F. Brittain in *St. Giles* (Cambridge, Heffer) presents in brief space the results of a critical study of the cult of the saint "of poor folk, chief patron".

Forty years after the first issue Unwin has republished Jessopp's *Coming of the Friars and other Essays*.

Sir William Ashley's important study on *The Bread of Our Forefathers* was completed shortly before his death and is now published by the Clarendon Press.

It is expected that the first volume of the *Cambridge History of the British Empire* will be published early in 1929. It will be under the editorial direction of Professor J. Holland Rose, Professor A. C. Newton, and Mr. E. A. Benians. Vol. I. is entitled *The Old Empire, from the Beginning to 1783*; vol. II., *The Growth of the New Empire, 1783-1870*; vol. III., *The Empire Commonwealth, 1870-1921*. Vol. IV., *British*

*India*, and vol. V., *The Indian Empire from 1497-1918*, which also will form a part of *The Cambridge History of India*, are being prepared by Professor H. Dodwell. For vol. VI. on *Canada and Newfoundland* the editors will be assisted by Professor W. P. McC. Kennedy; for vol. VII., *Australia and New Zealand*, by Professor Ernest Scott and Professor J. Hight; for vol. VIII., on *South Africa*, by Professor E. A. Walker.

Although written for a popular audience, *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners*, edited by Victor von Klarwill and translated by T. H. Nash, contains important Hapsburg correspondence from the Austrian archives (London, Lane).

The Cambridge University Press has published *Church and State: Political Aspects of XVI. Century Puritanism*, by the Rev. A. F. Scott Pearson (New York, Macmillan). This deals mainly with the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift.

The tercentenary of John Bunyan's birth is marked by the publication of a number of volumes, good, bad, and indifferent. Among the first may be noted *John Bunyan, his Life, Times and Works* by J. Brown, revised by F. M. Harrison (Hulbert), and *John Bunyan* by W. H. Hutton in the "People's Library" (London, Hodder).

Sir Almeric Fitzroy, from his fullness of knowledge, has written *The Privy Council from the Earliest Times* (London, Murray).

Helmut Kittel has written a study of Oliver Cromwell (*Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte*, edited by Emanuel Hirsch and Hans Lietzmann) that stresses the subject as a religious leader (Berlin and Leipzig, Gruyter).

*The Board of Trade*, by Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith (New York, G. P. Putnam), traces the history of the development of the board as a part of the general commercial development.

The *Voyages and Cruises of Commodore Walker*, British privateer-maître, has been reprinted for the first time since 1762 with introduction and notes by H. S. Vaughan (London, Cassell).

The Royal Historical Society expects before long to publish another volume of its series of *Diplomatic Instructions*, which will give the instructions to the ambassadors to France from 1727 to 1740.

The Rede Lecture for 1928 was by Sir Michael Sadler on *Thomas Day, an English Disciple of Rousseau*. He was the author of *Sandford and Merton*, and the lecturer has included "a survey of the mind of the mid-eighteenth century England in which Day lived".

The Hon. Sir John Fortescue in *Six British Soldiers* (London, Williams and Norgate) has published essays on Cromwell, Marlborough, Wellington, Moore, Abercromby, and Stuart.

The *Clinton Papers* of the William L. Clements Library consist of some 35,000 documents and 350 manuscript maps. The Library also possesses the papers of Lord Germain of which less than one-half have been printed. The Library has now published "Brief Descriptions" of these treasures, which we hope to have reviewed in the January number.

Two stately volumes of the Roxburghe Club (distributed to members only) are devoted to *A Selection from the Papers of George III., November 1, 1781, to December 20, 1783*, edited by Sir John W. Fortescue, and containing 1057 letters and documents.

A contribution from the University of Toronto dealing with the economic history of Great Britain in the nineteenth century is C. R. Fay, *Great Britain from Adam Smith to the Present Day* (Longmans).

*Memories and Reflections, 1852-1927*, by the Earl of Oxford and Asquith, has been published by Little, Brown (Boston) in an American edition.

*British Foreign Policy under Sir Edward Grey*, by the Graf von Montgelas, is an adverse criticism of the pre-war administration of the British Foreign Office, translated from the German by W. C. Dreher (Knopf).

A recent volume in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace series is *British Food Control* by Sir William H. Beveridge (Oxford University Press).

*A Bibliography of the Works of Sir Charles Firth*, edited by E. S. de Beer, will probably have been published by the Oxford University Press before this notice can be read.

All American scholars who had the privilege of knowing A. L. Smith will welcome the publication, by Murray, of his life. He was a remarkable scholar although he published, I think, only one book, *Church and State in the Middle Ages*. He was a great teacher and a loveable companion. The life is written by his wife with the title, *Arthur Lionel Smith, Master of Balliol (1916-1924)*.

As vol. 115 of the *British and Foreign State Papers*, a General Index to vols. 94-114 has been published by H. M. Stationery Office, covering the issues of the years 1900-1921.

Vol. II. of T. C. Meech's *This Generation: a History of Great Britain and Ireland, 1914-1926* (Dutton), is, according to the preface, a record of events as they happened, and a realistic portrayal of the actual life of the community as it is lived by normal people, written for people of all ages and every walk of life.

*The Diary of John Young, S.T.P.*, dean of Winchester from 1616 to 1653, consists of extracts from the manuscript, discovered in 1918 by the librarian of Winchester Cathedral, edited by Florence R. Goodman (Macmillan).

Charles Pendrill's *Wanderings in Mediæval London* (London, Allen and Unwin) has much to say of methods of trade, the water supply (mainly from the Thames), the gardens within the city (one wonders at the number in such a restricted and crowded space), and the "glorious uncertainty" of proper names.

The hundredth and last quarterly number of the *Scottish Historical Review* was published in July. Probably the article of most general interest is the Scottish Parliaments of Edward I., with a table, by H. G. Richardson and George Sayles. G. G. Coulton defends the need of exploiting the neglected records of visitations of monasteries before the dissolution, which he has carried on so energetically in spite of censure. Among the other articles are the Founders of the Company of Scotland by George Pratt Insh, the Scottish Trader in Sweden by the Hon. George A. Sinclair, Scottish Students at Louvain University by J. H. Baxter. There are many valuable notes and reviews. The excellence of the contents makes us regret again that the *Review* is not to be continued. The editor in his prefatory note speaks of the ambition of its founders that the level of scholarship should be high and says that "they were prepared to risk the chance that the *Review* might be called dull". Certainly the former has been true but not the latter.

Murray is about to publish a new history of the Stuarts with the title, *Scotland's Royal Line*, by Grant R. Francis. It is mainly concerned with the period of the "Pretenders".

*The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century*, by H. G. Graham, is published in this country by Macmillan.

Neil Munro has written a *History of the Royal Bank of Scotland, 1727-1927* (Edinburgh, R. and R. Clark).

Longmans announces a volume by J. T. Findlay on the early life of General Wolfe, entitled *Wolfe in Scotland in the '45 and from 1749-1753*.

In the book, *The Training of Teachers in Scotland, an Historical Review*, by Robert R. Rusk (Edinburgh, the Educational Institute of Scotland, 1928), "attention has centered mainly on the origin and early phases of the various aspects of the movement, the later developments being more easily accessible in official Reports". Sources are quoted, frequently at length; there are many notes and an extensive bibliography; in fact the book furnishes ample material for some one to write an account of the training of teachers in Scotland.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Olga Dobiache-Rojdestvensky, *Un Manuscrit de Bède à Léningrad* (*Speculum*, July); H. G. Richardson, *Richard fitz Neal and the Dialogus de Scaccario*, II. (*English Historical Review*, July); Elisabeth G. Kimball, *Tenure in Frank Almoign and Secular Services* (*ibid.*); S. H. Thomson, *Some Latin Works Erroneously Ascribed to Wyyclif* (*Speculum*, July); C. L. Kingsford, *The*

*Beginnings of English Maritime Enterprise* (History, July); C. N. Fay, *The Significance of the Corn Laws in English History* (Economic History Review, January); Harry M. Cassidy, *The Emergence of the Free Labor Contract in England* (American Economic Review, June); W. T. Morgan, *Great Britain: Nine Years after the Armistice* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); F. M. Powicke, *Gerald of Wales* (John Rylands Library Bulletin, July).

#### FRANCE

*L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151* by Josèphe Chartrou centres around *Foulque de Jérusalem et Geoffroi Plantagenet* and is well documented (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France).

Champion (Paris) announces a small volume, *Un Financier Colonial au XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Jacques Coeur*, by René Bouvier.

A new volume in the series of *Landmarks of History*, edited by Bernadotte E. Schmitt, has just appeared (New York, Crofts). It is entitled *The Establishment of French Absolutism, 1574 to 1610*, and is by Franklin Charles Palm of the University of California.

*Le Paris de Louis XIII., 1610-1643*, by Jacques-Thomas de Castelnau has been issued (Paris, Hachette).

Karl Federn's *Richelieu* has been translated by Bernard Miall (London, Allen and Unwin).

Albert Duchêne has written an historical account of *La Politique Coloniale de la France: le Ministère des Colonies depuis Richelieu* which is published, with a preface by Gabriel Hanotaux, by Payot (Paris).

A study in military history by Gaston Zeller is entitled *L'Organisation Défensive des Frontières du Nord et de l'Est au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Berger-Levrault).

M. Pierre de Nolhac, of the French Academy, continues his studies of Versailles and the court of France by a volume, gracefully written but seriously constructed from the appropriate sources, on *Louis XV. et Marie Leczinska* (Paris, L. Conard, pp. 343).

In *Les Forces Secrètes de la Révolution: Fr. M. Judaïsme*, L. de Poncins has presented a satisfying summary of interest and value (Paris, Bossard).

The latest volume in the collection "Vies des Hommes Illustres" (no. 18) is *La Vie de Lafayette* by Jacques Kayser (Paris, Nouvelle Revue Française).

A translation of *La Révolution Française* by Professor Albert Mathiez (reviewed, XXVIII. 356, XXX. 641, XXXIII. 185) of the University of Paris has been made by Catherine Alison Phillips and is announced for publication by Alfred A. Knopf of New York.

*Le Jardin de Picpus* by G. Lenôtre is a study of the prisons, the victims, and the scenes of the Terror (Paris, Perrin).

Among other books on Napoleon are *Napoléon-Florilège* by René de Vivie de Régie (Arcachon, Gironde) and the second part of Albert Meynier's *Les Coups d'État du Directoire* entitled *Le Vingt-deux Floréal An VI. (11 Mai 1798) et le Trente Prairial An VII. (18 Juin 1799)* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France).

Another life of Talleyrand is useful in both historical and diplomatic studies. The latest, by G. Lacour-Gayet, is published by Payot, Paris.

Helmut Göring is the author of *Tocqueville und die Demokratie*, published by Oldenbourg of Munich.

Somewhat light, yet informing, is Frédéric Loliée's *Frère d'Empereur : le Duc de Morny et la Société du Second Empire* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1928, pp. 367).

*Les Mémoires de la Reine Hortense, publiés par le Prince Napoléon*, 3 volumes, has been translated with some omissions, *The Memoirs of Queen Hortense*, 2 volumes (London, Thornton Butterworth).

The study by Hermann Oncken entitled *Rheinpolitik Napoléons III.* (reviewed in this journal, XXXII. 109) has been translated by Edwin H. Zeydel and published as *Napoleon III. and the Rhine*. It has a foreword by Ferdinand Schevill but the copious documents of the German edition have been omitted (New York, Knopf).

*La Captivité de Napoléon III. en Allemagne* (September, 1870–March, 1871) is by Paul Guériot (Paris, Perrin).

*Les Entretiens de l'Impératrice Eugénie* is the latest book of Maurice Paléologue and is published by Plon (Paris).

Marcel Chaminade has produced a study entitled *L'Expérience Financière de Monsieur Poincaré* (Paris, Geuthner).

For the history of art Albert Morance publishes *La Miniature sur Email en France* by Henri Clouzot of the Musée Galliera.

Venot (Dijon) publishes *L'Art Roman de Bourgogne* by Charles Oursels.

P. Banéat of the Musée at Rennes is the author of *Le Département d'Ille-et-Vilaine, Histoire—Archéologie—Monuments*, of which the first of the four volumes has just appeared (Paris, J. Larcher).

Two local histories published by G. Ficker (Paris) are *Histoire du Mont Saxon, des Origines à 1815* by Abbé Joseph Rennard, and *Histoire Générale de Semur-en-Auxois* by Alfred de Vaulabelle (with a preface by E. Levasseur).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Marcel Gouron, *Alienor de Castile en Guienne, 1286–1289* (Moyen Age, January–April); J. E. Hamilton, *Alsace and Louis XIV.* (History, July); Paul Emard, *Jacques Amyot, Grand Aumonier de France Supérieur des Quinze-Vingts Pauvres Aveugles du Roi, 1560–1593* (Revue du Seizième Siècle, XIV. 3–4); G. Rit-

ter, *Der Freiherr vom Stein und die Politischen Reformprogramme des Ancien Régime in Frankreich* [concl.] (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVIII, 1); Paul-M. Bondois, *La Torture dans le Ressort du Parlement de Paris au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française, July-August); Henri Sée, *Ship Owners of Saint Malo in the Eighteenth Century* [trans. by Alice M. Belcher] (Bulletin of the Business Historical Society, June); Crane Brinton, *Political Ideas of the Jacobin Clubs* (Political Science Quarterly, June); Sir Reginald Bloomfield, *The Revolt of the Camisards* (Quarterly Review, April); A. A. Thierry, *La Journée de 10 Août, 1792* [journal of a member of the Swiss Guard] (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1); Marcel Langlois, *Saint-Simon Historien* (Revue Historique, May-June); Léon Vignols, *Une Expédition Négrière en 1821 d'après son Registre de Bord* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, May-June).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

*The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis, Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J., 1542-1621*, by James Broderick, has been brought out in two volumes by P. J. Kennedy (New York).

*A History of Italian Law*, by Carlo Calisse, is a translation by L. B. Register, for the Continental Legal History series published by Little, Brown (Boston).

The following important studies in the history of modern Italy are in course of preparation by members of the "Scuola della Storia Moderna e Contemporanea": Capasso, *L'Italia e i Congressi della Santa Alleanza*, which is to be based on research in the documents at Vienna, and which, among its other objects, will supply the much-felt need of a compact account of the discussion of the interests of Italy at the Congress of Vienna; N. Rodòlico, a scholarly biography of Carlo Alberto; and A. Tamaro, a study of the development of the political and economic power of Austria on the sea, as it affected Italian interests in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (due to appear this year or next).

In the "Nouvelle Collection Historique" of Calmann-Lévy the latest volume is *La Reine d'Etrurie, 1782-1824*, by Prince Sixte de Bourbon (Paris).

The new book by Benedetto Croce (Bari, Leterza) is entitled *Storia d'Italia*; it is a philosophical story of Italian history from 1871 to 1914 written with "extreme detachment", as one reviewer puts it.

The principal article in the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* is in the series "Scrittori Contemporanei di Cose Romane". It deals with Thomas Ashby and is by F. Tomassetti.

In the collection entitled "Les Écrivains du Nouveau Siècle" Maurice Vaussard has written *Sur la Nouvelle Italie*, in which he deals with the Catholic attitude, the Free Masons, the Fascist policy, and the new literature (Paris, Valois).

Rafael Ballester has completed his *Histoire de l'Espagne des Origines jusqu'à nos Jours*, a study of institutions, manners, and customs, and of Spanish civilization in art and letters as well as a chronicle of events (Paris, Payot).

The Library of the Hispanic Society of America has published a brief description with facsimiles of their Incunabula of the *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso the Wise. The library is very richly supplied; three copies of the rarer first edition and four copies of the second. Both editions were published in 1491.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Pelzer Wegener, *A Classical Background for Fascism* (Classical Journal, June); G. Natali, *Appunti su la Cultura Tedesca in Italia e Italiana nei Paesi Tedeschi nel Secolo XVIII.* (Rivista d'Italia, March); G. Bustico, *Domenico Buffa e la Fondazione della Lega Italiana [1848]* (*ibid.*); G. A. Andrulli, *Pio IX. nel Risorgimento Italiano* (*ibid.*, May); H. Nelson Gay, *Mazzini e Antonio Gallenga Apostoli dell'Indipendenza Italiana in Inghilterra* (Nuova Antologia, July 16); A. Lumbroso, review of A. Salandra's *La Neutralité Italiana, 1914: Ricordi e Pensieri* (Rivista d'Italia, April); P. Leturia, *Felipe II. y el Pontificado según don Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga* (Estudios Eclesiasticos, July); Pérez Goyena, *A. Arias Montano y los Jesuitas* (*ibid.*).

#### GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

The Bulletin Historique (in the *Revue Historique* for July, 1928) by Marc Bloch is devoted to the material for the history of Germany brought out since the World War up to July, 1927.

Friedrich Meinecke has revised his *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*, which now appears in a seventh edition (Munich and Berlin, Oldenbourg).

A new volume in Below and Meinecke's "Handbuch der Mittelalterlichen und Neueren Geschichte" is *Deutsches Strafrecht bis zur Karolina*, by Rudolph His (Munich and Berlin, Oldenbourg).

Vol. 96 of "Die Geschichtschreiber der Deutschen Vorzeit" is *Das Leben von Bischof Otto von Bamberg*. This, the first translation into German of the life of the "apostle to the Pomeranians", is by Adolf Hofmeister who from his special knowledge has furnished an excellent introduction and translation of the text (Leipzig, Dyksche Buchhandlung, pp. xxix, 78).

In vol. I. of his *Berlin im Dreissigjährigen Kriege*, Eberhard Faden gives a true picture of old Berlin (Berlin, Deutscher Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte).

A somewhat caustic arraignment of the old régime in Germany is Dr. Hans Rost's *Die Viertausendjährige Zerstörung der Grossdeutschen Gedankens* (Innsbruck, Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia).

The fourth volume of *La Politique Extérieure de l'Allemagne* (1870-1914), containing official documents published by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, includes the period from November 1, 1883, to September 30, 1886, and is translated from the German by Henri Audoin (Paris, Costes).

Oldenbourg (Munich and Berlin) publishes a volume on military history: *Deutsche Kriegs- und Heeresgeschichte in den Umrissen Dargestellt* by Priv.-Doz. Dr. Eugen von Frauenholz.

*Die Deutschen Weissbücher zur Auswärtigen Politik 1870-1914, Geschichte und Bibliographie*, by Johann Sass, adds to the background an interpretation of this material, while making it more accessible.

Eduard Meyer's *Ursprung und Entwicklung des Dynastischen Erbrechts auf den Staat und seine Geschichtliche Wirkung vor allem auf die Politische Gestaltung Deutschlands* was published in June (Berlin, Gruyter).

A recent volume in the "Collection de Mémoires, Études et Documents pour Servir à l'Histoire de la Guerre Mondiale" is the *Journal d'un Député au Reichstag pendant la Guerre et la Révolution*, by Conrad Haussmann. It is especially important for the internal policy of Germany, 1914-1918.

*Die Regierung des Prinzen Max von Baden und die Konservative Partei 1918*, with a foreword by Oskar Johann von Freyend, has been published by the Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft (Berlin).

One of the useful recent books is that by Jules Chancel which, under the title *Dix Ans Après*, sketches the history of Germany during the last ten years (Paris, Fayard).

The first four numbers of the new Czechoslovak political review *Moderna Stat* have appeared this year. The editors are Professors Bohumil Baxa, Arn. Bláha, Vilém Funk, František Weyr of the Czechoslovak universities, Dr. Bedřich Bobek, Dr. Josef Fišer, Dr. Alfred Fuchs, Dr. Konstantin Jelinek, Dr. Antonín Klimt, and Dr. Jaroslav Krejčí; Dr. Krejčí is managing editor. M. Vilém Koudelka acts as responsible editor. In the first number Dr. Jelinek has an article on the Alsatian question of some historical content. The bibliographies, though unannotated, are to be commended (Prague).

For the study of certain present-day political questions *Die Ausbreitung des Deutschtums in Südtirol im Lichte der Urkunden*, edited from the sources by Dr. Otto Stolz, is most enlightening (Munich and Berlin, Oldenbourg).

A biography of the Catholic Bishop of Geneva, *Saint Francis de Sales, 1567-1622*, by Ella K. Sanders, is published by Macmillan.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Friedrich Philippi, *Der Markt der Mittelalterlichen Deutschen Stadt* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXX-

VIII. 2); Herman von Petersdorff, *Kaiser Wilhelm I. in seinen Briefen* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); O. Westphal, *Deutscher Liberalismus im Zeitalter Bismarcks* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVIII. 1); Walter Goetz, *Die Bairische Geschichtsforschung im 19. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, CXXXVIII. 2); *Deutscher Plan zu Oesterreichs Zerfall* (Der Krieg, May); G. E. R. Geyde, *South Tyrol* (Contemporary Review, July).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

General Review: P. Bouenfant, *Bibliographie de l'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine de la Belgique, 1927* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne, January–February).

The Oxford University Press has published under the title *The Siege and Relief of Leyden in 1574* a translation, by Elizabeth Trevelyan, of the late Robert Fruin's study of the Leiden struggle.

In 1693 the "Seventeen" of the Dutch East India Company charged Pieter van Dam, the company's advocate, forty-one years in their service, to prepare a full account of its constitution, government, trade, and history. After eight years' labor he presented to them his manuscript, which, though replete with valuable information for the student of the company and of early European trade with the East Indies, was never printed till, in 1927, the first volume was brought out (*Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën*, no. 63, I.) under the expert editorship of Dr. F. W. Stapel, *Pieter van Dam's Beschryvinge van de Oost Indische Compagnie* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. xxxviii, 772). This volume contains the portions relating to the organization and practices of the company, and the beginning of the history of the voyages.

Students of history will be interested in Anthony Bertram's *Sir Peter-Paul Rubens* because he has laid special emphasis on the artist's activities as a diplomat (London, Davies).

Worthy to be considered alongside much less valuable "war books" is *Le Cardinal Mercier Intime* by M. Berger-Creplet (Paris, Figuière).

Noteworthy article in periodical: Walter Reusch, *Der Flämische Nationalismus* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, VI. 4).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

In the Danish series of Professor Shotwell's books on the economic and social consequences of the war, there has been published an important volume by Einar Kohn, *Danmark under den Storc Krig: en økonomisk Oversigt* (Copenhagen, G. E. C. Gad, pp. xv, 333).

*Olavus Petri and the Ecclesiastical Transformation in Sweden, 1521–1552*, by Conrad Bergendoff, is published by Macmillan.

The Hon. Eveline Godley's *Charles the Twelfth of Sweden, a Study in Kingship*, published by Collins, is said to be an adequate presentation of the king's character but not of his ability as a commander (London).

In the *Festkift til Rektor J. Qvigstad, 1853-1928*, lately published by the Tromsø Museum, two valuable historical articles are to be noted, the first by Dr. Halfdan Bryn, "Ueber den Ursprung des Islandischen Volkes", the second by Professor Oscar A. Johnsen, on "Norsk-Dansk Handelsforbindelse med Nord-Russland under Kristian IV."

A new and revised edition of the *History of Russia* by Professor Sir Bernard Pares of the University of London is announced for publication this autumn (Knopf).

Boris Nolde, formerly of the University of Petrograd, is the author of a history of the origins and development of the Russian Revolution, printed as *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution Russe* (Paris, Armand Colin).

Payot (Paris) has issued the French translation, by Vladimir Lazarevski, of the *Archives Secrètes de l'Empereur Nicolas II.*, the documents belonging in general to the year 1914-1917 but containing also an interesting correspondence of the Tsar with the Dowager Empress in 1905-1906.

*The Fall of the Russian Empire*, the story of the last of the Romanovs and the coming of the Bolsheviks, by Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., has been brought out by Little, Brown (Boston).

René Fülöp-Miller's *Le Diable Sacré Raspoutine et les Femmes* has been translated from the German by A. Lecourt (Paris, Payot).

Payot (Paris) publishes a French translation by M. Jeanson of the somewhat personal *Dernières Années de la Cour de Tzarskoie-Sélo*.

In the *Oeuvres Complètes* of Lenin, the first of the four volumes announced for 1928 has appeared: *Les Débuts de la Révolution Russe* (no. XX.). The other volumes to be issued this year are: *Matiérialisme et Empiriocriticisme* (XIII.), *Période de l'Iskra, 1900-1902* (IV.), *La Première Révolution Russe, 1905* (VII.) (Paris, Éditions Sociales Internationales).

The work on Lenin by Valeriu Marcu has been translated by E. W. Dickes and published by Macmillan.

A joint survey of *Soviet Russia in the Second Decade*, made by the technical staff of the first American Trade Union Delegation, is published by the John Day Company (New York).

*The Real Situation in Russia* (Harcourt) is a translation by Max Eastman of documents, alleged to have been suppressed by the present government, in which Leon Trotsky attacks Stalin.

*Le Kremlin de Moscou: ses Cathédrales—ses Palais—ses Trésors d'Art*, by G. K. Loukomski, is a new art book of historical interest (Paris, Nilsson).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: George Gretor, *Islands Selbstdigkeit* (Europäische Gespräche, June); Anon., *Der Kampf um die Militärischen Rechte der Republik Polen in der Freien Stadt Danzig* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, VI. 2); Konrad Lehmann, *Osteuropäische Ortsnamen* (*ibid.*); J. Lewin, *Eine Schicksalsstunde Russlands* (*ibid.*).

#### SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

The June number of the *Slavonic Review* offers certain historical articles of great merit: William II.'s Balkan Policy, by R. W. Seton-Watson, the Slavonic Conference of 1898 and the Slovaks, by Albert Prazak, Poland and the Slavophil Idea, by W. Lednicki. R. J. Kerner completes his most interesting and informative study of the Mission of Liman von Sanders by discussing the Aftermath, and B. H. Sumner begins an article on New Material on the Revolt of Pugachev. The connection of Slavic art with the political and national aspirations of the southern Slavs is fittingly shown in W. C. Langdon's Medal Work of Ivo Kerdić.

At Warsaw there has just appeared the *Bulletin d'Information des Sciences Historiques en Europe Orientale* (vol. I, sections 1 and 2) published by the Fédération des Sociétés Historiques de l'Europe Orientale under the editorship of a committee of which Professor M. Handelsmann (Warsaw) is editor-in-chief. Besides "comptes rendus" there are articles and bibliographies for the countries of Slavic Europe.

Champion offers the beginning of a "Bibliothèque d'Études Hongroises" in which no. I. is an *Introduction à l'Histoire Hongroise*, with an introduction by Louis Halphen. The author is Ferenc Eckhart.

*The Caricatures of the "Winter King" of Bohemia* from the Sutherland Collection in the Bodleian Library, annotated with notes and translations by E. A. Beller, is published by the Oxford University Press and will be reviewed in this journal.

*Quinze Ans d'Histoire Balkanique (1904-1918)* by Colonel Lamouche sheds light on the Macedonian Question, Young Turks, Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, the Partition of Turkey, the World War, and the Treaty of Neuilly (Paris, Payot).

A Bulletin of the Extension University of Cluj contains an article by Professor Virgil I. Barbat entitled "Expropriarea Culturei".

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Emery Deri, *Hungary after the Terrors* (Menorah Journal, May); Seipels Antwort an die Kleine Entente (Europäische Gespräche, July); L. Silberstein, *Der Dreifrontenkampf des Jugoslavischen National-Ausschusses* (*ibid.*, July); David Angyal, Gabriel Bethlen (Revue Historique, May-June); H. C. Woods, *Romania, Yesterday and Today* (Fortnightly Review, July); H. C. Woods, *Turkey: Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Quarterly Review, April).

**ASIA. MEDIEVAL AND MODERN**

A new illustrated edition of Kevork Aslan's *Études Historiques sur le Peuple Arménien* has been brought out by Geuthner (Paris).

Lt.-Col. Sir Arnold T. Wilson is the author of an extensive work on *The Persian Gulf*, in which he traces the history from the earliest times to the beginning of the present century (Oxford, Clarendon).

George Schurhammer's *St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of India and Japan*, is a translation by F. J. Eble, published in St. Louis by Herder.

Col. John Bonham, "the last surviving officer of the defense of Lucknow", has published (London, Williams and Norgate) *Oude in 1857: Some Memories of the Indian Mutiny*.

A reprint of *Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China, 1844-1846*, by the two nineteenth-century monks, Evariste Régis Huc and Gabet, translated by William Hazlitt and edited by Paul Pelliot, has been published in New York by Harper.

Longmans has just published part IV. of Howorth's *History of the Mongols*. This contains the indexes which would have facilitated the use of the work by scholars during the half-century which has elapsed since its publication.

Thomas F. F. Millard, founder and editor of *The China Press* and of *Millard's Review*, has added to his books on the Eastern question *China, Where it is To-day and Why* (London, Williams and Norgate).

The first article (in Japanese) in *Shirin* for July (vol. XIII., no. 3) is by S. Inobe on "the national opinion provoked by the arrival of American expedition of Commodore M. C. Perry to Japan".

Noteworthy article in periodical: Alois Musil, *Religion and Politics in Arabia* (Foreign Affairs, July).

**AFRICA. MEDIEVAL AND MODERN**

The "Dark Continent" was so greatly neglected after the discovery of America that many students will be surprised to learn how accurately many parts of Africa were depicted in medieval maps and how extensive was the knowledge of the interior. There is a mass of information in *La Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen Age, Cartographes et Explorateurs*: vol. I., *L'Intérieur du Continent*; vol. II., *Le Péripole du Continent*; vol. III., *Un Explorateur Français du Niger*, by Charles de la Roncière (Cairo, Société Royale de Géographie d'Egypte, 1924-1927).

An important work for the understanding of present day conditions in Egypt is *Great Britain in Egypt* by Major E. W. Polson Newman (London, Cassell).

Whoever would trace the Alhambra and the Giralda back to origins will find material in *El Mansour le Doré, un Sultan de Marrakech au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, by Dr. Lucien-Graux (Fayard, Paris).

Two books on Morocco are in the list of Ernest Leroux: *Le Maroc et l'Europe* and *Quatre Siècles d'Histoire Marocain, au Sahara de 1504 à 1902, au Maroc de 1894 à 1912* (from native documents and archives), both by A. G. P. Martin.

For the archaeological and historical "Collection du Centenaire de l'Algérie" (1830-1930) Christian Schefer writes *L'Algérie et l'Évolution de la Colonisation Française* (Paris, Champion). It is especially important for the study of the changes in French policy during the reign of Louis-Philippe.

"The first exhaustive treatment of the African native as he has been affected by the coming of the Europeans" (see *Foreign Affairs*, July, p. 691) is contained in *The Native Problem in Africa* by Raymond L. Buell, published in two volumes by Macmillan.

Noteworthy article in periodical: Raymond Glazer, *La France en Tunisie: le Consul Vacher* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July).

#### AMERICA

Miss Grace G. Griffin's *Writings on American History* for 1924 (pp. xxiii, 292) deserves, for its thoroughness and careful preparation, the recognition that has frequently been given in these pages, of the value of this annual bibliography. The present volume, embracing 3428 items, follows the same excellent plan of the preceding issues.

Among the recent accessions of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress are the Horace Greeley Papers, consisting of manuscripts, scrap-books, and clippings, 1826-1872; the George P. Morris Papers, 1832-1862; the manuscript of William S. Lovell's journal of cruises to the Arctic, 1850-1851 and 1855; and 7 volumes of newspaper clippings and prints relating to Lafayette's tour in America, 1824-1825, compiled by Benjamin Thomas Hill.

During the Civil War the main building of the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., occupied by Federal troops, was burned, and the library was scattered. In some instances Federal soldiers picked up books and documents and carried them away as souvenirs, and such have been found still in the possession of Northern families. In connection with the interesting work of architectural restoration now going on at Williamsburg, both architects and librarian would be glad of information regarding any such possessions. Documents showing anything of past conditions of Williamsburg buildings will be especially welcome. Address Dr. Earl G. Swen, Librarian, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

The first article in the March number of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society is the presidential address of Daniel C. Donoghue on federal constitutional provisions with respect to religion.

The Princeton University Press has brought out *Our Relations to the Nations of the Western Hemisphere* by Charles Evans Hughes.

Mr. Mantle Fielding, 520 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, has printed in a limited edition (\$15) a *Dictionary of American Painters, Sculptors, and Engravers*, containing the biographies of nearly eight thousand artists.

The Foreign Policy Association in its *Information Service* has presented a summary of the accomplishments of the sixth Pan-American Conference (pt. I., April 27, pt. II., July 6).

A second edition has appeared of Graham H. Stuart's *Latin-America and the United States* (New York, Century Company). The developments of the last six years have necessitated many changes and additions.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Certainly a most interesting book for Americans is the *Moeurs et Histoire des Peaux-Rouges* by René Thévenin and Paul Coze, which was published in June by Payot (Paris).

E. de Boccard has just brought out another volume of the "Histoire du Monde" edited by E. Cavaignac. It is entitled *L'Amérique Pré-Columbienne et la Conquête Européenne* by Colonel Langlois.

Outside of a brief discussion concerning the last resting place of Christopher Columbus, the most interesting item in the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* (Havana) for 1928 is the *Contribución a la Historia de la Prensa Periodica*.

The quinquennial Loubat Prize, which in 1908 was awarded to the late Professor Herbert L. Osgood for his three volumes on *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, has lately been awarded by Columbia University, for the quinquennium just finished, to his posthumously published four-volume work on *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*.

Vol. II. of the reprint of the 1871 edition of Stiles and Aurand's *Bundling, its Origin, Progress, and Decline in America*, published by the Aurand Press in Harrisburg, has an additional modern chapter.

The August and September numbers of the *Atlantic* publish a translation of the journal kept by François, Marquis de Barbé-Marbois, who was secretary to the Chevalier de la Luzerne, French minister to the United States during the latter part of the American Revolution. The diary was written for the amusement of the marquis's fiancée and gives a very interesting picture of "Our Revolutionary Forefathers".

Larousse has just published *Les États-Unis* by Charles Cestre (Paris).

Beckles Willson, author of *The British Embassy in Paris*, has published *American Ambassadors to France, 1777-1927* (London, Murray) and has in press *American Ambassadors to London*. For the preparation of this book he has been given exceptional opportunities to consult the archives.

By an act signed by the President May 23, 1928, Congress created a George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission with an appropriation of one million dollars for the erection at Vincennes of a permanent memorial to Clark and the American Revolution in the West. Indiana has already provided for the purchase of the site of Fort Sackville upon which the memorial will be erected.

The American Peace Society has published a centennial history of the society, written by Edson L. Whitney (Washington, D. C.).

Vol. V. of the *American Secretaries of State*, edited by Samuel F. Bemis, includes the administrations of Daniel Webster, Abel Parker Upshur, John C. Calhoun, and James Buchanan.

A new biography of Lincoln entitled *Lincoln, Emancipator of the Nation*, is from the pen of Frederick T. Hill (Appleton).

C. Henry Smith has written a study of *The Coming of the Russian Mennonites*, "an episode in the settling of the last frontier, 1874-1884". It is published by the Mennonite Book Concern, Berne, Ind.

*Twenty Years with James G. Blaine*, by T. H. Sherman, Blaine's private secretary, is published by F. H. Hitchcock (New York).

*Oriental Exclusion*, by R. D. McKenzie, is a study of the effect of American immigration laws, regulations, and judicial decisions upon the Chinese and Japanese on our Pacific coast, prepared for the conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations (Chicago University Press).

D. Appleton and Company announce the publication of a life of William Jennings Bryan by J. C. Long. The title of the book is *Bryan: the Great Commoner*, and it is described as neither an attack nor a defense, but a presentation of Bryan's personality—"a cross between Saint George and Don Quixote"—and of the dramatic forces which made him the stormy petrel of politics for thirty years.

The publication this month of vols. III. and IV. of the *Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (vols. I. and II. were reviewed in this journal, XXXI. 812) has been announced by Houghton Mifflin.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

Following are the articles in the July number of the *New England Quarterly*: the Rise of William Phips, by V. F. Barnes; the Missionary Spirit in New England, by O. W. Elsbree; Marriage in Early New England, by C. L. Powell; Joel Shepard Goes to the War, edited by J. A. Spear; Walt Whitman Looks at Boston, by C. J. Furness; Mercantilism in the Massachusetts-Bay, by E. A. J. Johnson. There is also an interesting description by a Frenchman of Frenchman's Bay in 1792.

Professor Edmund Burke Delabarre of Brown University has brought out, through the firm of Neale, *Dighton Rock: a Study of the Written Rocks of New England*, the results of some thirteen years of investigation of those mysterious inscriptions, of which Dighton Rock is the most noted. The work is abundantly illustrated with photographs, maps, and drawings, and contains also bibliographies aggregating more than six hundred titles.

The first volume of *Province and Court Records of Maine* has been published by the Maine Historical Society (Portland).

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out *Ira Allen: Founder of Vermont, 1751-1814*, by James Benjamin Wilbur. The appearance of this work, upon which Mr. Wilbur has spent years of diligent research and study, will be especially gratifying to all who are interested in the formative period of Vermont and the nation.

*Letters from Brook Farm*, written by Mary A. Dwight, 1844-1847, have been edited by Amy L. Reed and published by Vassar College.

The *Annual Report* (May, 1928) of the Connecticut Historical Society contains a list (six pages) of the manuscripts acquired during the year. These are chiefly genealogical in character, but include some early church records, family and business correspondence, etc.

Russell Henry Chittenden is the author of a *History of the Sheffield Scientific School, 1846-1922* (Yale University Press, 2 vols.).

The Rhode Island Historical Society has published the *Letter Book of Peleg Sanford of Newport, Merchant (later Governor of Rhode Island), 1666-1668*. Sanford was a prominent citizen holding various offices, military and civil, and was for three years governor of the colony. He was engaged in trade and shipping. The eighty-eight letters which have been preserved throw light (oftentimes dimly) upon many subjects, in particular "the triangular trade between Newport, Barbados, and London", Narragansett horses and provisions; rum, molasses, and sugar; English dry-goods and hardware. Four indexes, persons, places, vessels, subjects, attest the richness of the mine of material to be worked by the specialist; the last index is especially interesting for the articles of trade at Newport in the seventeenth century. A series of letters from "Boston Goale" [gaol] show Sanford, although imprisoned, still engaged in "business as usual" and litigation, also as usual.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for June contains part II. of the New York Parks Exhibition. The July number contains part I. of a bibliography of Ethiopica and Amharica, with an introduction by the compiler, Dr. George F. Black. The bibliography is concluded in the August number, which has also an article on Seal-Prints and a Seal-Paste-Print of the Fifteenth Century, by Thomas O. Mabbott.

Articles in the April number of the *Quarterly Journal* of the New York State Historical Association are: Baroness Riedesel and other Women in Burgoyne's Army, by Amelia C. Parker; General Henry Knox's Ticonderoga Expedition, by Alexander C. Flick; and Troop Units at the Battle of Saratoga, by Borden H. Mills.

The July number of the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* contains a sketch of Chauncey Mitchell Depew; the Town Book of the Manor of Philipburgh (1742-1779); a biographical account of Captain Benjamin Merrill: a Pre-Revolutionary Revolutionist, by Samuel Merrill; the Fourth New York Regiment in the American Revolution, by Albert G. Barratt; a continuation of Abstracts of Sales by the Commissioners of Forfeitures in the Southern District of New York State, contributed by Theresa Hall Bristol; and other continuations.

The Linschoten Vereeniging has lately brought out, as the thirtieth volume of its publication, a volume which will be of interest to all students of New Netherland history, *De Zeevaartse Expeditie naar de West onder Cornelis Evertsen de Jonge, 1672-1674, Nieuw Nederland een Jaar onder Nederlandsch Bestuur* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1928, pp. lxix, 237), edited by C. de Waard of the Rijksarchief at Middelburg. The main item is the journal kept on board the *Swaenenburg*, but this is supplemented by a variety of other documents, illustrating fully the second Dutch occupation of New Netherland.

The *Eighteenth Annual Report* of the New York State Waterways Association contains the proceedings of the convention held at Oswego, November 11 and 12, 1927, including reports, addresses, some historical matter, and a modicum of grist for the future historian of New York's waterways.

Hon. Charles W. Parker contributes to the July number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society an article on Lewis Morris, First Colonial Governor of New Jersey; Cornelius C. Vermeule writes on Raritan Valley, its Discovery and Settlement; Rev. William H. S. Demarest, on the Reformed Church in America; and Charles A. Philhower, on Indian Currency and its Manufacture. There are also some early New Jersey muster-rolls and other similar items, besides serial contributions hitherto mentioned.

The July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains a Journal from Jersey to the Monongahela in 1788, by Colonel Israel Shreve; an article on Colonial Taverns of Lower Merion, by Charles R. Barker; the third of Isaac R. Pennypacker's papers on Military Historians and History; and the conclusion of Hon. William R. Riddell's study entitled *Libel on the Assembly: a Revolutionary Episode*.

Articles in the July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: a Sketch of the Pittsburgh Oil Exchanges, by John B.

Barbour; the Railroad Riots in Pittsburgh, April 21, 22, 1877, by James A. Henderson; a history of the Seneca chief, Cornplanter, by Henry K. Siebeneck; and further chapters in Percy B. Caley's *Life and Adventures of Lieutenant-Colonel John Connolly*.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The *Maryland Historical Magazine* has in the June number an Index to Chancery Depositions, 1668-1789, by William F. Cregar and Christopher Johnston; an article on the First Church in Charles County, by Louis D. Scisco; a further instalment of Maryland Rent Rolls; and a note, by Monroe Johnson, concerning the Maryland Ancestry of James Monroe.

Dr. G. M. Brumbaugh (905 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.) has brought out the second volume of his work, *Maryland Records: Colonial, Revolutionary, County, and Church*.

The July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* contains the second instalments of the letters of Moncure Robinson and of the Marriage Bonds of Norfolk County; the commission of Sir Thomas Wyatt (1624); "Propositions touching Virginia, 1625", presented by Sir George Yeardley; the address of Governor Wyatt and the Council of Virginia to the Privy Council, May 17, 1626; and the marriage register (1776-1798) of Rev. John Alderson, jr., pastor of the Linville Creek Baptist Church in Rockingham County, Shenandoah Valley, Va.

In *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for July Mr. S. A. Ashe, writing under the title the War between the States, discusses the question whether the Confederate soldiers were traitors and rebels. "Real History from a Mountaineer" is a letter from C. W. Lively to Professor Harold U. Faulkner, taking issue with him upon some of his statements in the article entitled *Colonial History Debunked*.

Vol. III. of the *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia*, May 1, 1705, to October 23, 1721, has been issued by the Virginia State Library. The library has borrowed the marriage bonds of the Isle of Wight and Southampton for use in making a marriage-bond register.

*The History of Old Alexandria, Virginia, from July 13, 1749, to May 24, 1861*, by Mary G. Powell, has been brought out, in a limited edition, by the author (Braddock Heights, Va.).

An autobiographical history of West Virginia, 1876-1926, by W. A. MacCorkle, is published by Putnam under the title *Recollections of Fifty Years*.

The July number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* has an article by David Y. Thomas on the Preservation of Arkansas History; one by C. K. Brown on the Florida Investments of George W. Swepson

(involving the Western Division of the Western North Carolina Railroad Company); a discussion of the activities of Alexander McGillivray, 1789-1793, by Arthur P. Whitaker; the concluding instalment of the Debate on the Fisher Resolutions, edited by A. R. Newsome; and a number of late eighteenth-century items taken from North Carolina newspapers.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has recently acquired 28,000 Legislative Papers, 1791-1901; 30,000 pieces of Onslow County court records, 1772-1857; a volume of the records of court-martials in Northampton County, 1824-1850; 13 letters from the papers of Robert F. Hoke; a letter of Andrew Jackson, 1815; 3 letters of Mrs. Jefferson Davis, 1893-1895; 30 photographic copies of maps relating to North Carolina from the collection secured from France, Spain, and Portugal, by L. C. Karpinski; photostats of about 2000 pardon-applications to President Johnson made by North Carolinians coming under the exceptions to the Amnesty Proclamation of May 29, 1865 (originals in the War Department).

The principal contents of the July number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* are continuations, namely: Mr. Henry A. M. Smith's paper on Goose Creek, and the Laurens and the Garth correspondence, both the latter annotated by Hon. Joseph W. Barnwell. A document of particular interest is an account of the losses sustained by Paul Grimball in consequence of the Spanish invasion of 1686.

The South Carolina Society of the Colonial Dames of America has published the second volume of the *Register of St. Philip's Parish, Charles Town or Charleston, S. C., 1754-1810*, edited by D. E. Huger Smith and A. S. Salley, jr.

J. G. Van Deusen's *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina* is published by the Columbia University Press.

The July number of the Florida Historical Society *Quarterly* contains an article by T. Frederick Davis on McGregor's Invasion of Florida, one by Minnie Moore-Wilson on the Seminoles of Florida, and part III. of the Letters of Samuel Forry, surgeon of the United States Army, 1837-1838.

The Baldwin County (Alabama) Historical Society has brought out a *Brief History of Baldwin County* (pp. 93), written and compiled by L. J. Newcomb Comings and Martha M. Albers. Incidents and episodes in the history of the region (which lies on Mobile Bay) from the Spanish beginnings in 1519 to the present have been gathered by the authors, supplemented by a number of contributions, principally pertaining to recent times, from the pens of others.

The January number of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* contains a paper by J. Fair Hardin on the Early History of the Louisiana State University and Subsequent History of its Site, "Camp Stafford", in

Rapides Parish; one by W. M. Murphy on the History of Madison Parish, La.; a sketch of William Beer (1849-1927), by Edward Laroque Tinker, with a list of his writings, by Miss Deynoodt; one of Judah Touro (1775-1854), together with his will, by James A. Renshaw; a Judicial Action in New Orleans, 1772, translated by Laura L. Porteous, with an introduction by Henry P. Dart; and continuations of other documentary publications.

## WESTERN STATES

The *Statistical Year-Book* of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, for the year 1927 (pp. 211), prepared by E. Eckhardt, has come from the press (St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House).

The March number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains an article by George S. Cottman on Lincoln in Indianapolis; one by Louis M. Sears on Robert Dale Owen as a Mystic; one by Luther M. Feeger on Boundaries of Wayne County and its Townships; and a letter from Judge John Law, historian of Vincennes, to his brother in Connecticut, written from Vincennes in 1835. Articles in the June number are: General Lafayette in Indiana, by Charles N. Thompson; the Education of a Backwoods Hoosier, by Dr. Harvey W. Wiley; an Early Indiana Political Contest (that between Daniel W. Voorhees and James Wilson in 1856), by Henry Lane Wilson; the Adoption of the Australian Ballot in Indiana, by Robert La Follette; and Warwick County and the Northwest Territory, by William L. Barker.

The *Indiana History Bulletin* devotes several pages of the June and July numbers (vol. V., nos. 9 and 10) to pilgrimages and exercises in connection with the George Rogers Clark celebration. Volume V., extra no. 3 (dated July), is *Recollections of the Civil War*, by Oran Perry, together with a biographical sketch of the writer by Col. A. B. Crampton.

The Indiana Historical Bureau published in September a *Bibliography of Indiana Laws, 1788-1927, including Laws of the Northwest Territory*. The volume has an historical introduction showing sovereignty and the law-making process over the territory now included in the state of Indiana.

The January number of the *Journal* of the Illinois State Historical Society contains an article by Rev. William E. Barton on the Hankses; one by Mrs. Sara J. English on George Rogers Clark; one by Paul W. Elder on Early Taverns and Inns in Illinois; and one by J. T. Dorris on President Lincoln's Clemency. The April number includes the Diary (1824-1825) of Mrs. Joseph Duncan, edited, with an introduction, by Elizabeth Duncan Putnam; a paper, by Erwin J. Urch, on the Public Career of William Barton Warren (1802-1865), major and lieutenant-colonel in the Mexican War; and a History of Trinity Church, Jacksonville, by Mrs. Sara J. English.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1927 includes the following papers: President Lincoln's War Problem, by Brig.-Gen. John M. Palmer; the Early Irish in Illinois, by Judge John P. McGoorty; Some Half-Forgotten Towns of Illinois, by Elbert Waller; Polish Exiles in Illinois, by Mrs. Isaac D. Rawlings; the Reaper as a Factor in the Development of the Agriculture of Illinois, 1834-1865, by Herbert A. Kellar; the Presidential Campaign of 1860, by Dr. Charles P. Johnson; the Pioneer Baptists of Illinois, by E. G. Lentz; and Lincoln Lands and Lineage: "A Typical American Migration", by Louis A. Watren.

The *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* has in the July number an article by Rev. John Rothensteiner on Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick and the Vatican Council; one by Rev. Paul J. Foik on the Martyrs of the Southwest; and continued articles.

*Mound Builders of Illinois*, a description of certain mounds and village sites along the Kaskaskia and Illinois rivers, by Addison J. Throop, is published in East St. Louis by the author.

Claudius O. Johnson has written a study of the World's Fair mayor of Chicago under the direction of the Local Community Research Committee of the University of Chicago, *Carter Henry Harrison I., Political Leader* (University of Chicago Press).

Mr. William E. Beard contributes to the October, 1925, number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (issued in May, 1928) an interesting account of a body of letters to James K. Polk, the letters being largely from the statesmen and politicians of the time. To the same number Austin P. Foster contributes a paper on David Crockett, and Rev. S. H. Chester writes of "African Slavery as I Knew it in Southern Arkansas", while from the *Allardt Neighbor* is taken a brief history of Allardt, Tenn., "one of the results of Rugby, although entirely disassociated". In the section of Documents is printed a Diary of the travels of William G. Randle, daguerreotypist, of Henry County, Tenn., in 1852.

The *Michigan History Magazine*, "Summer Number", includes among its contents the following articles: Some Unusual Relics in the Michigan Pioneer Museum, by E. F. Greenman; the Folk of our Town: a Sociological Study of Walled Lake, Michigan, by Henry O. Severance; History of the Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs, by Irma T. Jones; At Fort Mackinac a Century ago, by Harry L. Spooner; Three Islands, by Marion M. Davis; Cornish Miners of the Upper Peninsula, by James E. Jopling; and the Detroit Campaign of Gen. William Hull, by John G. Van Deusen.

The Marquette County Historical Society has issued a *Catalogue* of its collections of books, pamphlets, manuscripts, maps, etc., prepared by Miss Olive Pendill, curator. The society has come into possession during the last ten years of numerous manuscripts and maps of historical value.

Dr. Joseph Schafer contributes to the June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* a paper entitled Carl Schurz, Immigrant Statesman, being a compression of the introduction to his work *Carl Schurz: the Stressful Period*, which the State Historical Society of Wisconsin will presently publish. The Pioneer and Political Reminiscences of Nils P. Haugen are continued, as are also the letters of the Rev. Adelbert Inama. The present instalment of the latter is descriptive of a western trip in 1844.

The *Year Book* (1927) of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee (S. A. Barrett, editor, and Ira Edwards, assistant editor), contains an article on Early French Footprints in Canada, by R. S. Corwin, and a short historical sketch of the Hawaiian Islands, by S. A. Barrett.

Following are the articles in the June number of *Minnesota History*: Claim Associations and Pioneer Democracy in Early Minnesota, by Charles J. Ritchey; the Hill-Lewis Archaeological Survey, by Charles R. Keyes; Some Gaps in the History of the Northwest, by Joseph R. Starr; and State Historical Agencies and the Public, by Theodore C. Blegen. In the section entitled "Minnesota as Seen by Travellers" is an extract from Sir James Caird's *Prairie Farming in America* (New York, 1859).

The July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains a paper by T. P. Christensen on the State Parks of Iowa and the final instalment of the study by John A. Hopkins, jr., on the Economic History of the Production of Beef Cattle in Iowa. The latter has now been published by the State Historical Society in the Iowa Economic History Series.

The July number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an account of Pehr Dahlberg and the First Swedish Settlement in Iowa, by Robert Nelson Dahlberg and Charles Leonard Dahlberg; also a continuation of the analysis of the Iowa Public Archives by C. C. Stiles.

The June number of the *Palimpsest* contains a sketch, by Marie E. Meyer, of Nicholas Fejérváry, a Hungarian immigrant to Davenport in 1852, and an account, by Theodore F. Koop, of the extinct village of Bowen's Prairie. The July number contains a group of articles pertaining to the region nearly encompassed by the Iowa and Cedar rivers, a community of Quakers. It was in this region that Herbert Hoover spent the first ten years of his life, and therefore there is a sketch of Hoover and some reminiscences by him. The August number has a description of the battle of Wilson's Creek, Missouri (Aug. 10, 1861), adapted from the account by Frac B. Wilkie, which appeared in the *Dubuque Herald*, August 21, 1861.

The State Historical Society of Iowa will publish shortly a volume by Thomas H. Macbride entitled *In Cabins and Sod-Houses*, being "word pictures of places, persons, and events in a pioneer community in Iowa".

The *University of Iowa Extension Bulletin*, no. 186 (Aids for History Teachers, no. 9), is a Topical Survey of the Relationship of the United States to Australia, China, and Japan, by Bessie L. Pierce.

The *Missouri Historical Review* for July includes an address, by North T. Gentry, on Gen. Odon Guitar, with remarks by E. W. Stephens and C. B. Rollins; Exposition of an Early Diploma Mill, by E. A. Collins; a paper on the Progressive Movement in Missouri, by William T. Miller; an account, by E. M. Shepard, of the Historical Activities of the Springfield, Mo., University Club; and a continuation of William H. Richardson's Journal of the Doniphan Expedition.

The June number of the Missouri Historical Society's *Collections* contains addresses by Majors Albert B. Lambert and William B. Robertson, giving the Early History of Aeronautics in St. Louis; an account of Some Newly Discovered Missouri Maps, by Gilbert Joseph Garraghan, S.J.; a body of letters of James and Robert Aull, merchants in Lexington, Richmond, Liberty, and Independence, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, edited by Ralph P. Bieber; and part II. of the Journals of Jules de Mun.

A history of the architectural achievements of Missouri, edited by John Albury Bryan, has been published by the St. Louis Architectural Club, under the title, *Missouri's Contribution to American Architecture*.

The *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* has in the July number an account of Danevang, Texas, by Thomas P. Christensen; the first instalment of a series of documents (translations) pertaining to Tadeo Ortiz de Ayala and the Colonization of Texas, 1822-1833, edited by Edith L. Kelly and Mattie A. Hatcher; the second instalment of Mary V. Henderson's studies of Minor Empresario Contracts for the Colonization of Texas, 1825-1834; and other continuations.

The June number of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* contains a paper by Muriel Wright on the Removal of the Choctaws to the Indian Territory (a title, by the way, which appears to have slipped out of the table of contents); one by Annie E. Ford on Some Adventures of Captain Bonneville; one by Carolyn T. Foreman on Military Discipline in Early Oklahoma; Some Reminiscences of the Cherokee People, by Wiley Britton; a study by Dr. A. B. Thomas of the University of Oklahoma of Spanish Exploration of Oklahoma, 1599-1792; and other articles.

Among the articles in the June number of the *Colorado Magazine* are: the Hatcher Ditch, the oldest irrigation ditch (begun in 1846) now in use in Colorado, by A. W. McHendrie; Del Norte: its Past and Present, by Fred Espinosa; the Development of the Colorado Cattle Industry, by Robert Howe; and a sketch, by Frances Higgins, of E. H. N. Patterson, a pioneer journalist.

The July number of the *New Mexico Historical Review* contains the concluding instalments of John P. Clum's papers on Geronimo and of

Fred S. Perrine's account of Military Escorts on the Santa Fe Trail. Professor Francis V. Sholes of the State University of New Mexico gives a list of the manuscripts for the history of New Mexico in the National Library in the City of Mexico.

In the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are, besides some brief articles, an account, by Francis A. Garrecht, of the ceremony whereby he was adopted a member and made an honorary chief of the Yakima Indian Nation; the conclusion of Denys Nelson's article entitled *Yakima Days*; the first instalment of the narrative of James W. Watt, giving his experiences as a packer in Washington Territory mining camps during the 'sixties; and some letters (1857-1859) pertaining to the Hudson's Bay Company claims in the Northwest.

Articles in the June number of the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* are: History of Pioneer Sheep Husbandry in Oregon, by Alfred L. Lomax, and Indian Diseases as Aids to Pacific Northwest Settlement, by Leslie M. Scott. In the documentary section are: Robert Haswell's Log of the Sloop *Washington*, with introduction and annotations, by T. C. Elliott, and an instalment of the Diary of Henry Bridgeman Brewer, being the Log of the *Lausanne* and the Time Book of the Dalles Mission, with introduction by John M. Canse.

#### CANADA

In the *Canadian Historical Review*, June number, Arthur Berriedale Keith discourses upon Recent Changes in Canada's Constitutional Status, and S. Morley Scott upon Civil and Military Authority in Canada, 1764-1766. In the section of Notes and Documents are the articles of agreement and partnership (1803), establishing the trading firm of "Sir Alexander Mackenzie and Company". Mr. R. Harvey Fleming writes an introduction to the document.

The *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society*, vol. XXI., contains, besides proceedings, reports, etc., the following papers: a History of Canso, Guysborough County, Nova Scotia, by Harriet C. Hart; the Aikins Historical Prize Essays, Kings College, by Archdeacon Vroom; the Hon. Thomas Dickson Archibald, of the Court of Queen's Bench, England, 1817-1875, by Mrs. Charles Archibald; Life of the Hon. Jonathan McCully, 1809-1877, by Hon. Nicholas H. Meagher; and the Fortieth Regiment, Raised at Annapolis Royal in 1717, and Five Regiments Subsequently Raised in Nova Scotia, by Harry Piers. There is also a list of the papers read before the society from 1878 to 1927.

Vol. XXIV. of the *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society (Toronto, pp. 534) contains much about Col. Thomas Talbot, in whose honor a memorial cairn was dedicated June 30, 1926, and about the early history of the London district in which he lived. Of especial interest to students in the United States as well as in Canada, is an article by Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank on "The 'Chesapeake' Crisis as it

Affected Upper Canada". Another article, also by General Cruikshank, deals with Charles Lennox, Fourth Duke of Richmond, of general interest because of his exploits in England, Ireland, and Canada. It was his duchess who gave the famous ball at Brussels, June 15, 1814. About a quarter of the volume is taken up by petitions for grants of land, 1792-1796, with documents selected to illustrate the action of the Executive Council in exceptional cases. There are other papers of interest especially to the families whose ancestors are mentioned. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting and Annual Reports* of the society for the years 1926 and 1927 have appeared (pp. 59, 69).

*An Historical Atlas of Canada*, edited by L. J. Burpee, is published in Toronto, Ontario, by Albert Britnell.

Professor A. H. Young of Trinity College, Toronto, has published a *Partial Chronology of the Church of England in Canada* (pp. 24).

No. 56 (May) of the *Bulletin* of the Departments of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University is *Queen Anne's Canadian Expedition of 1711*, by William Thomas Morgan.

The Radisson Society, Toronto, has published *Alexander Mackenzie's Voyages*, edited by John W. Garvin.

#### AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Articles in the August number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* are: the Anglo-Venezuelan Boundary Controversy, by Paul R. Fossum; Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Venezuela, 1880-1915, by P. F. Fenton; and the Right of Asylum in New Mexico in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, by Elizabeth Howard West. Carl L. Lokke contributes, with an introduction, a memoir of Henri Liniers to the First Consul (1803) proposing an enterprise against Paraguay. In the Bibliographical Section is a note on Columbus as a Writer, by Robert Park.

V. T. Harlow's *Christopher Codrington, Governor of Barbados*, to be published by the Oxford University Press, will be of interest to students of colonial administration under William III. and Anne.

The *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report* (1927) of the Hawaiian Historical Society, with papers read at the annual meeting, February 24, 1928, contains the Story of the Honolulu Library and Reading Room Association, by Miss Mary A. Burbank, and a brief discussion, by J. M. Lydgate, of the story of the defeat of Kamehameha in 1796.

There has just appeared *Les Institutions et le Droit de l'Empire des Incas* by Paul Minnaert (Paris, Maisonneuve).

The Wetzel Publishing Company is just about to issue (in October) *Obregón's History of 16th Century Explorations in Western America*, a translation of the chronicle of Baltasar de Obregón, written in Mexico in

1584 and presented to King Philip II. of Spain. This historical record of the great Southwest, including Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Mexico, now for the first time published in English, has been translated, edited, and annotated by George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey (Los Angeles).

Of the translations of Bernal Diaz del Castillo's *Historia Verdadera de la Conquista de Nueva Espagna* (Madrid, 1632), reprints of two, Keatinge (first ed., London, 1800) and Maudslay, have appeared almost simultaneously. The reprint of the first, *True History of the Conquest of Mexico*, 2 vols. (London, Harrap; New York, McBride), has an introduction by Arthur D. Howden Smith. Maudslay's *Discovery and Conquest of Mexico, 1517-1521* (London, Routledge), is a reissue of the first half of his *True History of the Conquest of New Spain* (London, Hakluyt Society, 1908-1916). Keatinge followed the Spanish edition of 1632; Maudslay used the text of Genaro Garcia (Mexico, 1904), said to have been printed from an exact copy of the original manuscript.

*The Mexican Side of the Texan Revolution*, said to be composed from a compilation of old documents of General Santa Anna and others, now translated, for the first time, by C. E. Casteñada, is published in Dallas, Texas, by P. L. Turner.

Maurice Satineau has produced a study in the development of colonial policy under the old régime. His *Histoire de la Guadeloupe (1635-1789)* is published by Payot (Paris).

The first volume of a very learned and lengthy history of Brazil by Tobias Monteiro has been published by Briguiet of Rio de Janeiro. The title is *Historia do Império: a Elaboração da Independencia, 1808-1823*.

The Venezuelan government has recently acquired fifty-six volumes of archives from the *Apostadero* of Puerto Cabello for the period immediately preceding and during the Revolutionary War. It is understood that these will be turned over to the library of the Venezuelan Academy of History.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Brendan Lee, *An Apology for the Puritan* (Harper's Magazine, July); C. Fliniaux, *La Dette de Guerre des États-Unis à la France, 1777-1783* (Revue de Droit International, April-May-June); Brig.-Gen. John McA. Palmer, *America's Debt to a German Soldier: Baron von Steuben and What he Taught us* (Harper's, September); Theodore D. Jersey, *William L. Scruggs: a Forgotten Diplomat* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); Virginia G. Gray, *Activities of Southern Women, 1840-1860* (*ibid.*); W. D. Scott, *The Rapid Development of Mechanical Power and its Influence on Education in America* (Educational Record, July); *Letters of the Byrd Family*, cont. (Virginia Magazine, July); William L. Jenks, *Diary of the Siege of Detroit* (Michigan Historical Magazine, Summer); Saiz de la Mora, *Considerações Alrededor del Generalísimo Máximo Gómez* (Anales de la Academia de la Historia, 1925); E. B. Branson, *Some Observations on the Geography and Geology of Middle-Eastern Costa Rica* (University of Missouri Studies, January).

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Dr. Arthur E. R. Boak is professor of ancient history in the University of Michigan.

Dr. James P. Baxter, 3rd., is an assistant professor of history in Harvard University.

Dr. Ulrich B. Phillips is a professor of American history in the University of Michigan.

Dr. E. Raymond Turner is professor of European history in Johns Hopkins University.

Miss Gerda C. Richards is a graduate student in Radcliffe College.

Miss Elizabeth H. West is the librarian of the Texas Technological College at Lubbock.

